

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

JUVENAL  
SATIRE 6

EDITED BY LINDSAY WATSON  
AND PATRICIA WATSON

CAMBRIDGE

JUVENAL  
SATIRE 6

EDITED BY  
LINDSAY WATSON AND  
PATRICIA WATSON

*University of Sydney*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521671101](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521671101)

© Cambridge University Press 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United Kingdom by CPI Group Ltd, Croydon CRO 4YY

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-0-521-85491-7 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-67110-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

# CONTENTS

---

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page ix</i>
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	<i>x</i>
<hr/>	
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
1 <i>Juvenal: life and work</i>	<i>1</i>
2 <i>Satire 6: structure and themes</i>	<i>8</i>
(a) <i>The programmatic function of the prologue</i>	<i>11</i>
(b) <i>Correspondences between prologue and epilogue (ring composition)</i>	<i>11</i>
(c) <i>Recurrent themes giving unity to the Satire</i>	<i>13</i>
(d) <i>Connections between sections effected by thematic or linguistic copulae</i>	<i>14</i>
3 <i>Juvenal's anti-matrona</i>	<i>19</i>
4 <i>Misogyny in literature</i>	<i>26</i>
5 <i>The persona</i>	<i>35</i>
6 <i>Juvenal's style</i>	<i>48</i>
7 <i>Textual tradition and the Oxford fragment</i>	<i>51</i>
8 <i>Summary of Satire 6</i>	<i>55</i>
<hr/>	
<i>D. IVNI IVVENALIS SATVRA VI</i>	<i>57</i>
<hr/>	
<i>Commentary</i>	<i>77</i>
<hr/>	
<i>Appendix</i>	<i>283</i>
<i>Works cited</i>	<i>287</i>
<i>General index</i>	<i>313</i>
<i>Index of Latin words</i>	<i>318</i>





## PREFACE

---

The present work has been ten years in the making (we do not belong to the ranks of ‘more expeditious colleagues’ lauded by a previous contributor to the series). The reasons are many, but one will be wearisomely familiar (in a commentary on Juvenal some *libertas dicendi* is permissible): the endless proliferation of administrative tasks which make a mockery of the principle that 20 per cent of one’s working hours should be expended on this; in addition, an intellectual environment hostile to commentaries as methodologically antiquated, with consequent diversions into extremely time-consuming and unproductive byways. Gratitude is accordingly due to Sydney University for grants of study leave which permitted temporary alleviation of these and other burdens.

Different sections of the work were drafted by LW and PW, but the work of one was subjected to rigorous scrutiny by the other, with occasional bruising of feelings, but no serious domestic disputes (nothing at least approaching the matrimonial battlefield depicted in *Satire* 6). The volume was researched mainly in Oxford’s Sackler Library, an ideal venue for those whose interests straddle classical literature and social history.

Heartfelt thanks are due to those who have commented on part or the whole of previous drafts: Anne Rogerson, for constructive criticism of an early account of the Oxford Fragment, Peta Fowler, for suggestions which were fed into several of the notes, and Maxine Lewis, who used a partial draft of the commentary in her undergraduate teaching and on that basis indicated what might profitably be added. An especial debt is owed to two scholars: Kathleen Coleman, who, with her incomparable knowledge of ancient gladiators, made various suggestions which improved our commentary on the two substantial passages of *Satire* 6 which deal with the arena, and James Uden, who read the whole of the penultimate draft and produced with astonishing quickness a host of perspicacious criticisms and suggestions, on virtually all of which we have acted with gratitude. James, our one-time student at Sydney, conspicuously validates the principle that teachers learn much from their pupils. Finally, we must single out the contribution made by our editors, Philip Hardie and Stephen Oakley, who have read the whole work in draft and unerringly highlighted places where we had been imprecise or had not thought through issues with sufficient rigour.

We began this commentary with some trepidation as to whether we could say anything that had not already been said by Courtney or Duff. We hope that the length and *labor* of its gestation has permitted us to do so, but leave others to judge. At all events, it has been both a pleasure and a privilege to work on such a masterpiece of wit and comic hyperbole as *Satire* 6.

# ABBREVIATIONS

---

## 1. WORKS OF REFERENCE

Adams, <i>LSV</i>	Adams, J. N. 1982. <i>The Latin sexual vocabulary</i> , London
<i>ANRW</i>	Haase, W. and Temporini, H., eds. 1972–. <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> , Berlin
Brill's <i>NP</i>	Cancik, H. and Schneider, H., eds. 2002–10. <i>Brill's new Pauly: encyclopedia of the ancient world</i> , Leiden
<i>CAH</i> XI	Bowman, A. K., Garnsey, P. and Rathbone, D., eds. 2000. <i>The Cambridge ancient history, volume 11: the High Empire, AD 70–192</i> , 2nd edn, Cambridge.
<i>CGL</i>	Goetz, G. and Loewe, C. G. 1888–1923. <i>Corpus glossariorum Latinorum</i> , Leipzig
<i>CIG</i>	Boeckh, A. et al. 1828–77. <i>Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , Berlin
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , 1863–, Berlin
<i>CLE</i>	Bücheler, F. and Lommatzsch, E., eds. 1895–1926. <i>Carmina Latina epigraphica</i> , Leipzig
Courtney, <i>FLP</i>	Courtney, E. 1993. <i>The fragmentary Latin poets</i> , Oxford
<i>Dig.</i>	Mommsen, T., Krueger, P. and Watson, A. 1985. <i>The digest of Justinian</i> , Philadelphia
Dittenberg. <i>Syll.</i> <sup>3</sup>	Dittenberger, W. 1915–24. <i>Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 3rd edn, Leipzig
<i>FGrH</i>	Jacoby, F. 1923–. <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , Leiden
<i>GLK</i>	Keil, H., ed., 1857–70. <i>Grammatici Latini</i> , Leipzig
<i>GP</i>	Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L., eds., 1968. <i>The Greek anthology: the garland of Philip</i> , Cambridge
<i>HE</i>	Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L., eds. 1965. <i>The Greek anthology: Hellenistic epigrams</i> , Cambridge
H–S	Hofmann, J. B. and Szantyr, A. 1965. <i>Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik</i> , Munich
Housman, <i>CP</i>	Diggle, J. and Goodyear, F. R. D., eds. 1972. <i>The classical papers of A. E. Housman</i> , Cambridge
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> , 1873–1914, Berlin
<i>ILS</i>	Dessau, H., 1892–1916. <i>Inscriptiones latinae selectae</i> , Berlin

K–A	Kassel, R. and Austin, C., eds. 1983–. <i>Poetae comici Graeci</i> , Berlin
K–E	Köhne, E. and Ewigleben, C., eds. 2000. <i>Gladiators and Caesars</i> , English edn by R. Jackson, London
K–S	Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. 1971. <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache</i> , vol. II, 4th edn rev. by A. Thierfelder, Hannover
Lausberg	Lausberg, H. 1998. <i>Handbook of literary rhetoric</i> tr. M. Bliss, A. Jansen and D. Orton, Leiden
LIMC	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> . 1981–99, Zurich
L–P	Lobel, E. and Page, D. eds. 1955. <i>Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta</i> , Oxford
LSJ	Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R. eds., rev. Jones, H. S. 1968. <i>A Greek–English Lexicon</i> . Oxford
LTUR	Steinby, E. M., ed. 1993–9. <i>Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae</i> , Rome
N–H	Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. 1970/1978. <i>A Commentary on Horace : Odes Book I/II</i> , Oxford
N–R	Nisbet, R. G. M. and Rudd, N. 2004. <i>A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III</i> , Oxford
OLD	Glare, P. G. W., ed. 1982. <i>Oxford Latin dictionary</i> , Oxford
Otto	Otto, A. 1890. <i>Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer</i> , Leipzig
Paroem.	Leutsch, E. L. and Schneidewin, F. W., eds. 1839–51. <i>Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> , Göttingen
Peek, Gr. Versinschr.	Peek, W. 1955–7. <i>Griechische Versinschriften. Bd. 1. Grab-Epigramme</i> , Berlin
PGM	Preisendanz, K., ed. 1973–4. <i>Papyri graecae magicae</i> , 2nd edn rev. by A. Henrichs, Stuttgart
PIR <sup>2</sup>	<i>Prosopographia imperii Romani saeculi I,II,III</i> , 1933–, 2nd edn, Berlin/Leipzig
Platner–Ashby	Platner, S. and Ashby, T. 1929. <i>A topographical dictionary of ancient Rome</i> , Oxford
P. Oxy.	<i>The Oxyrhynchus papyri</i> , 1898–, London
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , 1941–, Stuttgart
RE	Pauly, A., Wissowa, G. et al., eds. 1893–1980. <i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , Stuttgart

Richardson	Richardson, L., Jr. 1992. <i>A new topographical dictionary of ancient Rome</i> , Baltimore/London
<i>Script. physiogn.</i>	Foerster, R. ed. 1893. <i>Scriptores physiognomonici graeci et latini</i> , Leipzig
SHA	<i>Scriptores Historiae Augustae</i>
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus linguae Latinae</i> , 1900–, Leipzig/Munich
Treggiari, <i>RM</i>	Treggiari, S. 1991. <i>Roman marriage: iusti coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian</i> , Oxford
von Arnim	von Arnim, H. ed. 1903–24. <i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , Leipzig
Wissowa, <i>RK</i>	Wissowa, G. 1912. <i>Religion und Kultus der Römer</i> , 2nd edn, Munich
Woodcock	Woodcock, E. C. 1959. <i>A new Latin syntax</i> , London
W–W	Watson, L. and P., eds. 2003. <i>Martial: select epigrams</i> , Cambridge

## 2. JUVENAL: EDITIONS, COMMENTARIES AND TRANSLATIONS

Bellandi	Bellandi, F. 1995. <i>Giovenale contro le donne (Satira VI)</i> , Venice
Braund	Braund, S. M., ed. and transl. 2004. <i>Juvenal and Persius</i> , Cambridge, Mass.
Clausen	Clausen, W. V. 1992. <i>A. Persi Flacci et D. Iunii Iuuenalis saturae</i> , rev. edn, Oxford
Courtney	Courtney, E. 1980. <i>A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal</i> , London
Duff	Duff, J. D. 1970. <i>D. Iunii Iuuenalis saturae XIV</i> , rev. by M. Coffey, Cambridge
Ferguson	Ferguson, J. 1998. <i>Juvenal: the Satires</i> , Bristol
Friedländer	Friedländer, L. 1895. <i>D. Iunii Iuuenalis saturarum libri V</i> , Leipzig
Green	Green, P. 1998. <i>Juvenal: the sixteen satires. Translated with an introduction and notes</i> , 3rd edn, Harmondsworth
Hendry	Hendry, M. 2004. <i>D. Iunii Iuuenalis Saturae. Edidit breuique apparatu critico instruxit</i> , <a href="http://www.curculio.org/Juvenal/">http://www.curculio.org/Juvenal/</a>
Housman	Housman, A. E. 1931. <i>D. Iunii Iuuenalis saturae. Editorum in usum</i> , 2nd edn, Cambridge
Knoche	Knoche, U. 1950. <i>D. Iunius Iuuenalis Saturae</i> , Munich.
Laudizi	Laudizi, G. 1982. <i>D. Giunio Giovenale: Il frammento Winsted; Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento</i> , Lecce.

- Nadeau Nadeau, Y. 2011. *A commentary on the sixth satire of Juvenal*, *Collection Latomus* 329, Brussels
- Ribbeck Ribbeck, O. 1858. *D. Iunii Iuvenalis saturae*, Leipzig
- Richlin Richlin, A. 1986. *Juvenal Satura vi*, Bryn Mawr, PA
- Ruperti Ruperti, G. A. 1820. *D. Iunii Iuuenalis opera omnia ex editione Rupertiana: cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini*, London
- Willis Willis, J. 1997. *D. Iunii Iuuenalis saturae sedecim*, Stuttgart/Leipzig



# INTRODUCTION

---

## 1 JUVENAL: LIFE AND WORK

Almost nothing is known about J.'s life. Whereas his main predecessors in satire, Lucilius, Horace and, to a lesser degree, Persius, had incorporated personal information and confidences in their poems,<sup>1</sup> as one element in the fashioning of the intimate, confessional and conversational tone which characterised their works,<sup>2</sup> J. – particularly in his first two books (*Sat.* 1–6) – adopts a hectoring, declamatory voice which precludes the vouchsafing of intimacies and is, it is generally agreed, a rhetorical creation having limited connection with the historical Juvenal.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, even the best of the various biographies attached to the MSS of J.<sup>4</sup> seemingly represents no more than a tissue of extrapolations from the poems themselves. Nor can a now lost inscription from Aquinum (*CIL* x 5382), which speaks of a *Iuuenalis* as tribune of a cohort of Dalmatians and *flamen* of the deified Vespasian, be reliably associated with our Juvenal,<sup>5</sup> for all that the latter had a demonstrable association with the place (*Sat.* 3.319 *tuo... Aquino*). Arguably the most concrete and salient information about J. comes from his older contemporary Martial, who, addressing him as a friend in three epigrams,<sup>6</sup> describes him traipsing round the city to attend on wealthy patrons (12.18.1–6: cf. *Sat.* 1.99–101), and as *facundus*, possessing oratorical skill (7.91.1).<sup>7</sup> Interestingly, there is no mention of poetic activities on J.'s part in even the last of the epigrams, which dates to the very beginning of the second century AD, but *facundus* connects with the satirist's remark that he received the conventional rhetorical education of any well-to-do Roman (*Sat.* 1.15–17) and with the pervasive influence of rhetoric in his Satires, discussed below.

<sup>1</sup> For Lucilius see the remarks of Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.30–4; for Horace, *Satires* 1.4–7, 1.9–10, 2.1 and 2.6–7 in particular; for Persius, *Satires* 3 and 5 especially. It is not of course to be supposed that such supposedly autobiographical detail represents the literal truth. Rather, it is one facet in the construction of a poetic 'I' which the author wishes to project. It is, for example, most unlikely that Horace's father was a one-time slave, as he claims (*Sat.* 1.6.6, 45–6): see Watson 2003: 1, with bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> It is no accident that Horace (similarly Lucilius) refers to his Satires as *sermones*, conversation pieces; cf. Coffey 1976: 68–9, Rudd 1986: 85.

<sup>3</sup> See intro. § 5.

<sup>4</sup> Attributed by Valla to 'Probus' in his 1486 edition. A text is printed in Clausen's *OCT* of J., p. 179.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Braund 1996: 16.      <sup>6</sup> 7.24, 7.91 and 12.18.

<sup>7</sup> The meagre tranche of additional facts about J. which can be gleaned from his Satires, none significant for the understanding of his poetry, is assembled by Coffey 1976: 119–23.



Given the paucity of internal data and the lack of reliable *testimonia* on the author,<sup>8</sup> it is difficult to establish J.'s literary chronology with any precision.<sup>9</sup> An allusion in *Sat.* 1.49–50 to the condemnation of Marius Priscus (AD 100) and a seeming reference in *Sat.* 2.102–3 to Tacitus' *Historiae*, composed approximately between AD 105–110,<sup>10</sup> possibly also to his *Annals*,<sup>11</sup> has led to the conclusion that book 1 (*Sat.* 1–5) cannot have appeared much before AD 115.<sup>12</sup> These passages, in combination with *Sat.* 1.25, where the satiric speaker looks back to an earlier phase of his life when as a young man (*iuuenis*) he still sported a beard – Romans wore a beard until the age of 40<sup>13</sup> – have in turn suggested that J. was born some time in the 60s AD. A dense series of allusions in *Sat.* 6.407–11 to events of AD 113–17<sup>14</sup> establishes 117 as a *terminus post quem* for *Satire* 6 (book 2); it may have been published along with book 1.<sup>15</sup> It is generally accepted that the emperor addressed in flattering terms at the opening of *Satire* 7 is Hadrian, who succeeded Trajan upon the latter's death in 117 and arrived in Rome in the middle of the following year. Book 4 (*Sat.* 10–12) contains no internal chronological markers, but there are two references in book 5 (*Sat.* 13–15 and the unfinished<sup>16</sup> 16) to the year 127. The poet died at some undeterminable time thereafter. J. appears to have been little read in the two hundred years following his death, but in the latter half of the fourth century came back into vogue.<sup>17</sup>

The defining characteristic of J.'s *Satires* has always been viewed as *saeua indignatio*, fierce outrage at a world in which moral debasement can go no further.<sup>18</sup> This impression J. cultivates in *Satire* 1 by punctuating his text with angry outbursts, as instances of the rich and vicious pass before the satirist's offended gaze.<sup>19</sup> That impression is additionally

<sup>8</sup> J. lived too late to be included in Suetonius' *De uiris illustribus*, which contains a partially preserved *De poetis*.

<sup>9</sup> See Duff xiv–xxiii, Highet 1954: 4–19, Coffey 1976: 119–23, Braund 1996: 15–16 for more detailed accounts than can be offered here.

<sup>10</sup> *Res memoranda nouis annalibus atque recenti | historia*, referring to the reign of Otho, dealt with in Tacitus, *Historiae* 1–2.

<sup>11</sup> Two passages in the early books, 2.56.1 and 4.5.2, look to be datable to AD 114 and 115 respectively.

<sup>12</sup> Relevant here is the oft-quoted opinion of Syme 1984: 1143 (cf. 1156) 'there is no sign, let alone proof, that Juvenal published or even wrote anything before 115, or indeed before 117'.

<sup>13</sup> See commentary on 105–6. <sup>14</sup> See *ad loc.*

<sup>15</sup> Much as Horace's *Carmina* 1–3 were issued together in 23 BC.

<sup>16</sup> Or 'mutilated by an accident of transmission' (Coffey 1976: 135). Similarly Highet 1954: 156–8 and Parker 2012: 149.

<sup>17</sup> Highet 1954: 180–90.

<sup>18</sup> *Sat.* 1.147–9 *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat | posteritas. eadem facient cupientque minores, | omne in praecipiti uitium stetit*; 13.28–30.

<sup>19</sup> Notably 30–1 *difficile est saturam non scribere. nam quis iniquae | tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut teneat se?* and 63–4 *nonne libet medio ceras implere capaces | quadriui?* in

underscored when J. plays up the pugnacity of the poets whom he names as his inspiration for writing satire, Lucilius and Horace. The former is represented as an epic warrior, blazing with anger and laying about sundry corrupt and criminal personages with satirical sword:<sup>20</sup> a tendentiously one-dimensional picture of Lucilius' poetry.<sup>21</sup> The latter is the subject of the indignant rhetorical questions *haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna? | haec ego non agitem?* (51–2): again a wilfully reductive account, which ignores the elusive, shifting perspectives of Horace's *Satires* and elides their kaleidoscopic variety of theme. The sense of one whose outrage at contemporary vice knows no bounds is further enhanced by J.'s making his speaker parade in *Satires* 1–6 the stylistic features – angry exclamations, short, punchy sentences and the like – associated in the rhetorical tradition with *indignatio*, and likewise harness the topics and sentiments which, according to the specialist handbooks of oratory, best afforded opportunities for stimulating and articulating indignation.<sup>22</sup>

The above is not the full story, however. After *Satire* 6 a change comes over J.'s speaker, who no longer bellows at the top of his voice, but modulates into a more rational, restrained tone which melds sympathy for the victims of Rome's corrupt *mores* with an irony that casts a disquieting pall over those expressions of sympathy.<sup>23</sup> Nor does such a description cover all the modalities of J.'s later *Satires*.<sup>24</sup> The much admired *Satire* 10, for example, is a disenchanted exposé of the follies and self-destructive tendencies of human aspirations, 13 a mock-*consolatio*<sup>25</sup> with a distinctly platitudinous and moralising overlay, 15 a gruesome, at times tongue-in-cheek, narrative of a cannibalistic orgy in Egypt.

As Kenney demonstrated,<sup>26</sup> a satiric convention arose whereby, in a programmatic piece, the poet would issue an *apologia* for the writing of satire and defend himself against an interlocutor who pointed out the disadvantages and risks attendant upon the penning of verses attacking individuals. In answer, the satirist would conclude with a deliberately flip-pant evasion of the objections raised by his opponent. J.'s variation on this theme involves an abrupt and startling climb-down after the threats, trumpeted throughout *Sat.* 1, of attacks on contemporaries: namely that he will assault only those whose ashes are covered by the Flaminian way, that is,

the face of Rome's monsters of vice. Cf. also 45–8 *quid referam quanta siccum iecur ardeat ira, cum...*? etc.

<sup>20</sup> *Sat.* 1.165–7 *ense uelut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens | infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est | criminibus, tacita sudant praecordia culpa.*

<sup>21</sup> A balanced account can be found in Rudd 1986.

<sup>22</sup> See further intro. 7–8, 36–7, 49, 51.

<sup>23</sup> For this approach see particularly Anderson 1962 = 1982: 277–92 and Braund 1988. For criticisms of it as inadequate see Plaza 2006: 249–53 and Gold 2012.

<sup>24</sup> See conveniently Braund 1988: 178–98.

<sup>25</sup> Braund 1988: 190. <sup>26</sup> Kenney 1962.

the dead (170–1). This notorious evasion has elicited a variety of scholarly responses: that J.'s targets represent type-figures embodying vices belonging to the here and now (to put it another way, the living are assailed under cover of the dead);<sup>27</sup> that this is merely the last and most stark of a number of intimations in *Sat.* 1 that the Speaker is a flawed, fallible construct characterised by self-interest and hypocrisy;<sup>28</sup> that lines 170–1 are not so much an evasion as a rational recognition of the fact that to utter public criticisms of prominent individuals or voice dissent, even by implication, against the current regime continued to be almost as dangerous as it had been for much of the first century AD.<sup>29</sup> The advent of Trajan did not necessarily mean that *carte blanche* was suddenly given to *libertas*, frank speech.<sup>30</sup>

All this is of relevance to *Satire* 6. Just as, for example, J. devotes almost a whole poem to attacking the long-dead Domitian and his imperial *consilium* (*Sat.* 4), or pillories Nero as parricide and *flaneur* who prostituted his regal dignity on the public stage (*Sat.* 8.211–30), so in *Satire* 6 two of the most lurid episodes involve figures from the Domitianic and Claudian eras respectively, Eppia and Messalina (82–113, 114–32). A number too of the aristocratic women named in the *Satire* as emblematic of one vice or another belong to long-extinct families, while many other targets are simply designated by an essentialising 'she' or 'they'. There is a curious impersonality to all this, almost as though the Speaker were dealing in generic rage.

When Horace sought to distinguish his satiric hexameters from more dignified types of verse, he appealed to their conversational quality, labelling them *sermoni propiora* and *sermones*... | *repentes per humum*.<sup>31</sup> J. by contrast has traditionally been located at the opposite end of the stylistic spectrum, held to embody the so-called 'grand style',<sup>32</sup> whose exponent, as Cicero put it,<sup>33</sup> was *amplus, copiosus, gravis, ornatus*, 'elaborate, abundant, impressive and ornate', possessed of *uis*, rhetorical power, and well fitted *ad permouendos et conuertendos animos*. But in a revisionary paper Jonathan Powell<sup>34</sup> persuasively<sup>35</sup> argued that J.'s use of the high style is sporadic rather than sustained, that occurrences are invariably harnessed

<sup>27</sup> Thus e.g. Coffey 1976: 125 and 138. <sup>28</sup> Braund 1996: 116–21.

<sup>29</sup> Rudd 1986: 62–6, 71–4. Further approaches to the vexed conclusion of *Satire* 1 are noted by Plaza 2006: 48–9.

<sup>30</sup> Coffey 1976: 136–7, Rudd 1986: 80–1. Waters 1969 showed that the autocratic tendencies of Domitian were maintained by Trajan, who also employed many of the same *amici*, some decidedly dubious.

<sup>31</sup> *Sat.* 1.4.42, *Epist.* 2.1.250–1. Cf. also *Sat.* 2.6.17 *satiris musaque pedestri*.

<sup>32</sup> See particularly Scott 1927 and Bramble 1974: 164–73; also Rudd 1986: 107–9.

<sup>33</sup> *Orat.* 90, 20. <sup>34</sup> Powell 1999.

<sup>35</sup> See Jones 2007b, Morgan 2010: 345 n. 210 (Powell's view is 'self-evident'), Kenney 2012: 125.

to effects of parody or mockery, and that when the satirist does appropriate the high style, he regularly brings it crashing down to earth by the juxtaposition of a word of low register, as with the intrusively prosaic *serraca* at *Sat.* 5.22–3 *illo tempore quo se | frigida circumagunt pigri serraca Bootae*. These views seem essentially correct, if perhaps in need of minor modification.<sup>36</sup> At other times, his verse can by design give, in Powell's words, 'the impression of a chaotic mixture of stylistic levels', as in the comic account of the fatal street accident at 3.257–67.<sup>37</sup> Above all, Powell notes, it is vital to read in context certain passages which have too often been construed as programmatic announcements that J. is adopting the elevated manner associated with epic or tragedy or, a related claim, that the viciousness of contemporary Rome is such that satire has by necessity become heroicised, supplanting the played-out epic genre.<sup>38</sup> Accordingly, the ringing epicisms of *Sat.* 1.168–70 *tecum prius ergo uoluta | haec animo ante tubas: galeatum sero duelli | paenitet* are no advertisement of a new epic-satiric mode, but a necessary set-up for the humiliating, deflationary climb-down which immediately follows.<sup>39</sup> And when, in *Sat.* 6.634–7, J. meets the objection of an imaginary interlocutor with the words *tingimus haec altum satura sumente coturnum | scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum | grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu, | montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino?*, he is not making a proclamation about his preferred style, as is often assumed.<sup>40</sup> Rather, he is expropriating the stylistic modalities of the *genera grandia*, tragedy and epic, in order to underpin linguistically the (indubitably hyperbolic) claim which constitutes the climax of *Satire* 6, that the monstrous crimes previously associated with the impassioned females of Greek tragedy have become a reality in contemporary Rome, indeed that the cold-blooded criminality of Roman wives overtops that of the tragic paradigms.

In his *Themes in Roman satire*, Niall Rudd observes that satire operates within a triangle of which the apices are attack, entertainment and preaching.<sup>41</sup> For many centuries critical opinion on J. emphasised the last

<sup>36</sup> As James Uden points out to us *per litteras*, J.'s controlled and striking modulation between different linguistic registers attests the highly wrought literariness of his style; hence Powell's characterisation (1999: 316) of J.'s predominant mode as 'argumentative conversational discourse' is somewhat reductive. In addition, as Jones 2007b demonstrated (albeit certain of his criteria are too slippery to allow of definite conclusions), J.'s metrical technique is in general closer to that of non-satirical hexameter poets than that of earlier satirists, and in certain respects (separation of noun and adjective within the verse, avoidance of wholesale elision) suggests the deliberate pursuit of stylistic elevation.

<sup>37</sup> Powell 1999: 327, with his analysis of the passage, 327–8.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Braund 1996: 21–4. <sup>39</sup> See discussion above.

<sup>40</sup> Any more than he is at *Sat.* 15.29–31, where he states that the episode of cannibalism among the Egyptians which the *Satire* treats is *cunctis graviora coturnis*.

<sup>41</sup> Rudd 1986: 1 *et passim*.

function: he was seen as an uncompromising censor of morals and castigat-  
 or of vice<sup>42</sup> – notwithstanding the discomfiting relish that he frequently  
 takes in depicting the morally repulsive or debauched,<sup>43</sup> or the oppor-  
 tunistic wit of passages such as 6.10 *et saepe horridior glandem ructante mar-  
 ito*.<sup>44</sup> But in the last fifty years or so a radical change has come over Juvena-  
 lian scholarship. Almost all the emphasis since the 1950s has been on the  
 element of entertainment, J. being hailed as a supreme master of wit. Of  
 especial note here are his favourite technique of a grandiose build-up fol-  
 lowed by a banal, ironic or debunking conclusion,<sup>45</sup> comic hyperbole<sup>46</sup>  
 and a humour which deflates the moral outrage which notionally ani-  
 mates his verse, e.g. 6.100–1, on the contrasting gastric reactions of wives  
 and adulteresses to sea-travel, whereby ‘the woman who goes off with a  
 lover has a strong stomach; the other pukes all over her husband (*maritum  
 conuomit*)’.

For long, of central importance in approaching J.’s humour has been  
 the idea that it is focalised primarily through the persona, a literary  
 construct whose fallibilities, fatuities, self-contradictions and self-serving  
 hypocrisy deliberately expose him to readerly ridicule and incredulous  
 dissent (see further below on this). In recent years, however the terms  
 of the debate have shifted somewhat, questioning or modifying persona  
 theory, and taking a more global approach to humour in satire. Of partic-  
 ular note are two recent works by Rosen and Plaza,<sup>47</sup> the latter of which,  
 informed by theories of humour, offers several observations which make a  
 real contribution to analysing J.’s satiric wit, not least in *Satire* 6: first that J.  
 typically exalts his targets in order to bring them down to earth by mockery  
 and ridicule, a pattern seen in the hyperbolically magnified monsters of  
*Satires* 1 and 6 especially;<sup>48</sup> next, that J. gets a lot of comic mileage out of  
 ‘reverse stereotypes’ such as the female gladiators of *Sat.* 6.246–67, where  
 the humour depends upon the outrageous overturning of societal norms  
 (in this case patriarchally-coloured notions of feminine physical weakness

<sup>42</sup> Some examples in Rudd 1986: 28. See also below 36, 37 n. 205.

<sup>43</sup> E.g. the titillating lubriciousness of J.’s description of the Bona Dea rite in  
*Sat.* 6.314–45 or the equally suggestive account of the *Gaditanae* at 11.162–75 –  
 hardly appropriate to the moralising context. For this tension, intrinsic to the satiric  
 persona, see Anderson 1964: 127 = 1982: 293.

<sup>44</sup> Or 10.191–5, on the afflictions of age, where sympathy might have seemed  
 more in order than mockery.

<sup>45</sup> E.g. 6.502–6, a *matrona* who is an Andromache from the front, a Pygmy  
 from the rear. Further instances are discussed by Martyn 1979, with that peculiar  
 humourlessness which infects scholars dissecting ancient humour.

<sup>46</sup> E.g. 6.655–6 *occurrent multae tibi Belides atque Eriphylae | mane, Clytemestram nul-  
 lus non uicus habebit*.

<sup>47</sup> Rosen 2007, Plaza 2006.      <sup>48</sup> Plaza 2006: 105–55.

and sexual modesty);<sup>49</sup> lastly, the intriguing suggestion that the women of *Satire* 6 are so unrepentantly and risibly triumphant in their excesses that the text, contrary to its declared purpose, may be read as subintentionally feminist.<sup>50</sup>

Lastly, a word on rhetoric in J., with which the issue of the persona is closely intertwined.<sup>51</sup> J. has long been seen as rhetorician quite as much as satirist.<sup>52</sup> In an influential work De Decker usefully classified the influence of rhetoric in J. under three headings,<sup>53</sup> subject-matter (*loci de saeculo, de fortuna, de diuitiis* etc.), compositional techniques and stylistic influences (lapidary *sententiae*, apostrophe, anaphora etc.) – although, as has been noted, De Decker might have made it clearer that the imprint of rhetoric was pervasive in the prose and poetry of the first and second centuries AD,<sup>54</sup> not something peculiar to J. Beyond this, the topics of several Satires seem indebted to the stock theses of the rhetorical schools; for example, one of the springboards for *Satire* 6 may have been the rhetorical *progymnasma* on the question of whether one ought to marry,<sup>55</sup> while *Satire* 3 is coloured thematically by the *syntaktikon*, speech of a departing traveller,<sup>56</sup> but also has intimations of the rhetorical thesis, ‘is life in the city or country preferable?’<sup>57</sup> Exemplarity, the mustering of parallels from history or mythology in order to bolster an argument, is a key weapon in rhetoric’s armoury and so widespread in J. as to require no discussion here:<sup>58</sup> it will suffice to refer to *Satire* 10, the best-known instance. Accusations of sexual malfeasance and deviance, the thematic core of *Satires* 2, 6 and 9, were a stock-in-trade of forensic oratory under the Roman republic<sup>59</sup> and from there passed to its jejune and artificial offshoot, the declamatory rhetoric of the Empire. Here too the influence on J. is palpable: for example, Sen. *Contr.* 1.2, concerning a would-be priestess who had worked in a brothel, evidently influenced the Messalina scene of *Satire* 6 both in overall conception and details. Two further manifestations of rhetoric in J., its contribution to the fashioning of a satiric voice seething with indignation, and the expressive possibilities of a satiric idiom flavoured at every turn by rhetoric, are discussed below under persona and style respectively. But enough evidence has hopefully been marshalled here to legitimise the

<sup>49</sup> Plaza 2006: 136–9.      <sup>50</sup> Plaza 2006: 127–55.

<sup>51</sup> See intro. § 5 on the persona.

<sup>52</sup> A useful brief synthesis of the influence of rhetoric on J. is provided by Braund 1996: 18–21.

<sup>53</sup> De Decker 1913.

<sup>54</sup> For the influence of declamatory rhetoric on the literature of the first century AD see Bonner 1969: 149–67.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 2.25, Braund 1992a.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Cairns 1972: 47–8.      <sup>57</sup> Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 2.24.

<sup>58</sup> See e.g. De Decker 1913: 107–10, Kenney 2012: 130–3.

<sup>59</sup> Richlin 1992: 96–104, Corbeill 1996: 104–27.

hermeneutics of E. J. Kenney's well-known question: 'Juvenal: satirist or rhetorician?'<sup>60</sup>

## 2 SATIRE 6: STRUCTURE AND THEMES

In 1954 Highet stated 'With the best will in the world, none of his expositors has ever been able to give a satisfying explanation of the plan of... the Sixth [Satire]' and this judgment still holds true.<sup>61</sup> Various problems, perceived or real, relating to the architecture of the poem have been identified by scholars.<sup>62</sup> These include:

- (1) Lack of overall structure. The Satire begins with an addressee, Postumus, who is considering marriage and whom the Speaker tries to dissuade, largely on the ground that no woman in contemporary Rome is faithful to her husband (*pudica*), so that it is impossible to find a suitable wife. So long as the topic of *impudicitia* is maintained (1–400 approx.), a degree of coherence subsists. But once this theme begins to flag, the poem becomes a general attack on *matronae* through a series of vignettes illustrating a variety of vices attributed to them. Additionally, the ending is somewhat abrupt, with no attempt to return to Postumus (not named since 377), or to draw any sort of moral, the murder of husbands being left to speak for itself.
- (2) Subjects are treated at varying lengths, the treatment being in some cases either disproportionately short (e.g. 242–5) or long (e.g. 512–91 on female superstition).
- (3) Transitions between sections are not always smooth (cf. 133–5, 349–51, 461nn.).
- (4) On occasion a theme is announced without being followed through, e.g. at 474–5 a detailed account of how women pass their entire day is promised, but only part of the day's activities is described.<sup>63</sup>
- (5) Subject matter is repeated in different parts of the Satire, e.g. stage performers (63–75; 379–97); the husband presented with a son resembling a low-class lover (76–81; 597–601).
- (6) The overall impression, according to many, is of an unstructured rant.

<sup>60</sup> Kenney 1963.

<sup>61</sup> Highet 1954: 170; for some discussions of the Satire's structure see Highet 1954: 91–103, Anderson 1956 = Anderson 1982: 255–76, Nardo 1973: 11–14, Bond 1979: 438–40, Smith 1980, Winkler 1983: 147–51, Bellandi 1991, Braund 1992a: 75, Bellandi 1995: 48–52.

<sup>62</sup> For a particularly harsh critique of *Satire* 6's alleged lack of structure see Friedländer's edn, p. 278.

<sup>63</sup> This might, however, be deliberate: see 474–5n.

Some of these difficulties can be explained by the unsatisfactory state of J.'s text, which has suffered from interpolations, transpositions and omissions: this applies especially to 2, 3, and 4 above (see intro. § 7). As to the alleged incoherence of the Satire as a whole (1, 6), various attempts have been made to discern some sort of architectural cohesion.

Most agree that the Satire has a basic structure in the form of two main sections (25–285 and 300–633), the first preceded by a prologue (1–25<sup>64</sup>) introducing the main theme of the section (the absence of *pudicitia* among contemporary Roman women), the second prefaced by a further prologue addressing the origins of moral decline, and rounded off by an epilogue defending the incorporation into the satiric genre of subject matter (murderous *matronae*) which might seem more at home in tragedy.

Many have argued that the Satire is given a degree of unity by an overarching theme or themes. Anderson, for instance, giving prominence to the second prologue (286–300), in which women's moral decline is traced to foreign luxury, divided the Satire into two halves, the first dealing with adultery, the second with *luxuria*.<sup>65</sup> This approach accounts for Postumus' lack of prominence in the latter part of the poem: since this is not about marriage, he is no longer needed.<sup>66</sup> But the argument fails on the grounds that some topics which appear in the second half (e.g. the *matrona docta* 434–47) are not concerned with *luxuria*, while passages in the first half (e.g. 149–60 on the acquisitive Bibula) fit better with the theme of *luxuria* than adultery.

According to a more commonly held view, the Satire is an attack on womankind as a whole; the poem is replete with misogynistic topoi going all the way back to Hesiod (see intro. § 4). Proponents of this approach include Ferguson, Tennant<sup>67</sup> and, adopting a more conceptually sophisticated standpoint, Gold, Johnson and Plaza.<sup>68</sup>

Others have seen the Satire as held together by the theme of misogamy, most notably Highet 1954: 91–103, Bellandi<sup>69</sup> and, above all, Braund

<sup>64</sup> Some (e.g. Bellandi 1995: 48–52) take the prologue down to line 37.

<sup>65</sup> Anderson 1956 = Anderson 1982: 255–76.

<sup>66</sup> It also confronts the difficulty of themes being repeated, subjects included in both halves being treated from two different viewpoints (adultery and *luxuria*).

<sup>67</sup> Ferguson 1998: 185–6, Tennant 2002; cf. Anderson 1956 = Anderson 1982: 255–76.

<sup>68</sup> Gold 1994 (modified in Gold 2012: 108), Johnson 1996, Plaza 2006: 127–55, who sees the Satire as misogynistic (140, 154) but argues that the misogyny is enfeebled by the numerous uproarious vignettes in which women are presented as über-powerful, a patriarchal male's worse nightmare, so that the Satire sows the seeds of its own ineffectuality.

<sup>69</sup> Bellandi 1995: 13–14, who qualifies this, however, by stating that the poem is also an attack on female nature per se (14) and positing (31) that 'Juvenal's misogyny ... might be better characterised as a form of gynaecophobia.'



1992a, who argued that ‘Satire 6 is best understood not as a general diatribe against women but as a dissuasion from marriage, a λόγος ἀποτρεπτικός γάμου, informed by contemporary rhetoric and delivered by a misogynist.’ She pointed out that many of the foibles of women in the second half are described from the viewpoint of their impact on the husband, thus offering disincentives to marrying additional to women’s lack of *pudicitia*. Less convincingly, following Smith 1980, she also sees a ‘story-line’ which provides a general structure: Postumus wants to marry (and thus is figuratively mad); in the middle of the poem he does so (200–5); at the end he is driven literally mad by his wife (610–26) and in the poem’s concluding lines is murdered by her. It is not, however, clear that Postumus actually marries at 200–5,<sup>70</sup> and if the husband who is murdered at the end is Postumus, rather than husbands in general, he ought to have been named.

We suggest that the above two approaches to the Satire – misogynistic or misogamic – can to some extent be reconciled, since Greek and Roman texts dealing with the male experience of the female make little if any distinction between the categories of ‘woman’ and ‘wife’.<sup>71</sup> The unifying theme of the Satire, then, is the vices of Roman *matronae* – with the focus mainly, but not exclusively, on the upper classes. The opening dialogue in which the Speaker attempts to dissuade the addressee Postumus from his marriage plans is a peg on which to hang an initial attack on *matronae* as lacking *pudicitia* – the paramount virtue of the married woman and thus suitable for special attention. The conversation with Postumus effectively ends when he asks, in exasperation, ‘isn’t there a single woman who lives up to your standards?’ (161); in reply, the Speaker refuses to allow perfection even in a nonpareil like Cornelia – the supreme argument of an arch-misogynist and one that leaves no room for a reply. The Speaker having won his case, he now feels free to elaborate on his theme that there are no satisfactory women in Rome. Postumus, defeated, fades out of the picture<sup>72</sup> and, as the Speaker warms to his task, the Satire segues into a more general attack on married women.

In addition to the pattern just noted, it can be shown that the poet has exercised more care in composition than has been recognised. Notable

<sup>70</sup> The future tenses (201, 208, 212 etc.) in particular suggest that this is a warning rather than a description of something that actually happens.

<sup>71</sup> Moreover, in the writings on marriage which influenced J. greatly (see commentary *passim*), misogyny is so deeply interwoven with arguments *pro* and *contra* marriage that the two strands of discourse can hardly be disentangled. For both points see Watson 2008a: 271–5.

<sup>72</sup> He is not entirely forgotten, however, reappearing at 377 and implicitly addressed via the use of the second person sing. from time to time. But in terms of basic structure, the first part consists of dissuasion, the second description.

here are: (a) the way in which the prologue introduces certain themes programatically; (b) the numerous links between the prologue and the ending; (c) the unifying presence of certain themes which recur throughout the Satire; (d) the skilful management of the transitions between many of the sections.

(a) *The programmatic function of the prologue*

- (i) By commencing with a topos – the Myth of the Ages – from epic/didactic poetry, J. signals that he is embarking on a satire of epic proportions: at almost seven hundred lines the poem is not much different in size from many books of Virgil's *Aeneid* or Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.<sup>73</sup>
- (ii) The Satire's main subject – Roman *matronae* – is introduced early, in the shape of the primitive cavewoman, a prototype of the ideal wife.
- (iii) The pervasive theme of adultery is anticipated in the prologue in two ways. Firstly, J. manipulates the Hesiodic Myth of the Ages so that it is the Roman goddess Pudicitia who departs the Earth (cf. 20n.). Secondly, by emphasising the physical aspect of marriage (5–7n., 21–2n.), J. suggests that the cavewoman, though faithful to her husband, is nonetheless a sexual being, thus establishing a continuity between the wife of the prologue and contemporary wives.
- (iv) By its humorous and debunking treatment of the Myth (9–10nn., 14–15n., 17–18n.), the prologue establishes from the start the fundamentally mocking and unserious character of the Speaker.<sup>74</sup>

(b) *Correspondences between prologue and epilogue (ring composition)*

- (i) In both prologue and epilogue – in contrast to the rest of the Satire, where all the *exempla* of female behaviour are set firmly in Rome<sup>75</sup> – the world of literature is invoked, in the form of the Golden Age myth and tragedy respectively. In keeping with the overtly literary nature of the prologue, J. further contrasts the primitive cavewoman with two

<sup>73</sup> The poem is of unprecedented length in Roman satire: cf. Highet 1954: 91 ('a leviathan').

<sup>74</sup> See intro. § 5.

<sup>75</sup> The women in question move in a recognisably Roman landscape (the altar of Pudicitia, the Campus Martius etc.) and are either fictitious characters bearing Roman names like Ogulnia (352n.), or well-known historical figures such as Eppia (82–113), Messalina (114–32), or Cornelia (166–71).

*scriptae puellae* – Cynthia and Lesbia (7–8)<sup>76</sup> – rather than contemporary or historical examples.<sup>77</sup>

- (ii) The Lesbia of the prologue, weeping for her *extinctus passer* (7–8), finds a parallel at the end of the poem in the woman who would see her husband die to save her puppy (654n.). The reference to Lesbia (Clodia) might also be picked up at the close via the references to Medea and Clytemnestra (643, 656), which call to mind Cicero's styling Clodia a *Palatina Medea* (*Cael.* 18) and Caelius' description of Clodia, suspected of murdering her husband, as *quadrantaria Clytemnestra* (Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.53).<sup>78</sup> In addition, the Callimachean term *tenuis* 659 and its antonym *insulsus* 658 evoke the world of Catullus' Lesbia, whose *sal* and intellectual refinement are famously memorialised in *c.* 86.<sup>79</sup>
- (iii) In both prologue and ending, the sophistication of modern society is juxtaposed to the uncouthness of a past age: in the prologue, Lesbia and Cynthia (7–8) stand in contrast to the rustic cavewoman; at the end of the poem, the modern-day murderesses with their cool-headed attitude to killing and their subtle poisons (659n.) are contrasted with the far more unsubtle heroines of tragedy, who were carried away by passion and in the case of Clytemnestra wielded a 'stupid and clumsy' axe (657–8).
- (iv) The ending of the poem with its accumulation of crimes – murder of stepsons (627–8), children (629–45) and finally husbands (651–61) – recalls the Myth of the Ages in the prologue via an Ovidian intertext: the catalogue of crimes in the Iron Age (*Met.* 1.144–50), which sees conflict in a variety of personal relationships, including fathers and sons,<sup>80</sup> and – of particular relevance to the epilogue – stepmothers and stepsons (*lurida terribiles miscent aconita nouercae* 147). To suit the context, J. adapts the conventional wickedness of the Iron Age so that the murderous crimes are carried out solely by women.
- (v) In general, there is a downward spiral in moral standards from the beginning of the poem, where wives, initially paragons of *pudicitia*, become adulteresses, to the ending, where they murder their

<sup>76</sup> Even assuming that a real woman, Clodia, underlay Lesbia, the explicit recall of Catullus 2 and 3 in *cuius / turbauit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos* makes it clear that J. is here thinking of her as a literary character.

<sup>77</sup> This bookending of the Satire by obtrusively literary references prompts the thought that the Speaker is likewise a literary construct: see further n. 213 below.

<sup>78</sup> See Anderson 1956: 92–4 = 1982: 274–6 and Nardo 1973: 13.

<sup>79</sup> See Papanghelis 1991.

<sup>80</sup> 148 *filius ante diem patrios inquiri in annos*, paralleled in *Sat.* 6.565–7, where a woman consults astrologers about the death of family members.

husbands.<sup>81</sup> This ethical decline is encapsulated in the stark contrast between the cavewoman of the prologue and the depraved wives of the Satire's ending. The cavewoman, as the perfect *matrona*, is a homemaker who bears and nurses children. These obligations the modern-day women refuse to undertake (592–4), becoming rather the destroyers of the husband's home and family, killing his descendants, both potential (594–7) and actual (629–52), and eventually even the husband himself (655–61).<sup>82</sup>

(c) *Recurrent themes giving unity to the Satire*

- (i) The hypersexuality of *matronae* and their lack of *pudicitia*. This topic informs much of the Satire, including some of the most memorable episodes (e.g. Eppia, the Bona Dea rites). Its presence is felt even in sections which focus on other themes, e.g. the description of women's daily activities (474–507), where a woman's maltreatment of her servants is the direct result of her sexual frustration (475–6); the bluestocking of 434–56, whose first speech is in defence of the unfaithful Dido (435n.); the superstitious women, for whom predictions about the future often concern a lover (548, 567–8, 591).

Two leitmotives of the Satire also highlight women's *impudicitia*: (1) the predilection of upper-class women for lower-class lovers, especially performers on stage and in the arena (cf. 63–113, 279, 331–2, O23–6, 356, 379–97, 600–1) and (2) intertextual allusions to elegy which assimilate the adulterous *matrona* to the congenitally unfaithful elegiac *puella*, and the husband by implication to the abject elegiac lover (cf. nn. on 60–1, 140–1, 149, 206, 231–41, 272, O29–34, O32, 461–73 and 474–507).

As mentioned, there is an incremental progression in immorality throughout the Satire, culminating in murder. In keeping with this, the section 60–135 describes increasingly sensational cases of *impudicitia* (see discussion below), while the behaviour of the women at the altar of Pudicitia (306–13) is even more shocking, since it involves 'unnatural' sex. And in the following section on the Rites of Bona Dea the women go still further, not only defiling an important state ceremony by their sexual activities but additionally engaging in bestiality (334).

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Winkler 1983: 189–90.

<sup>82</sup> The allusions to the leaf-strewn bed of the cavewoman (5–7) and the gilded bed (594) of the modern *matrona* also serve to highlight the contrast between the simplicity and moral uprightness of the past and the *luxuria* which goes hand in hand with the ethical laxity of later times.

- (ii) The love of women for luxury and their spendthrift nature. Again, this vice becomes more extreme as the Satire progresses: at 149–60, the wife demands expensive gifts of her husband; later, even a woman whose financial circumstances are reduced will keep spending, till she exhausts her resources (355–65; cf. 511); finally, women's greed for money leads them to murder (629, 638n., 646, 651).
- (iii) The ill temper of women and their propensity for quarrelling with both their husbands (35–7, 268–85) and others. Eventually this descends into violence: beating the neighbours, including their dog (413–18), and the capricious ill-treatment of slaves (475–95).
- (iv) Wives as domestic tyrants who rule their husbands. This pervasive theme is foreshadowed early in the Satire (*dominam* 30, *capistro* 43) and spelled out in greater detail at 149–60, 207–30 (*iugum* 208 picks up *capistro*) and 276 (*uruca* n.). Once more, this aspect of feminine behaviour becomes increasingly marked as the poem progresses: the tyrannical wife at first only dominates her husband as long as her beauty lasts (149); later she is able to do what she wants, with the husband powerless to stop her (e.g. in the O fragment she foists *cinaedi* on the household); in the final part of the Satire women act quite independently, to the extent that they even control the family succession, foisting on the husband supposititious children of low blood (602–9). And the final humiliation, before they actually kill their husbands, is to drive them mad so that they are reduced to childish imbecility (612–14).
- (v) The *matrona* who encroaches on male preserves or apes male behaviours, becoming in the end a virtual man. Examples include female gladiators (246–67), the unsexed busybody who buttonholes men in the street (398–412 and 401n.), the woman who attends the baths at night and consumes man-like quantities of wine (413–33n.: cf. 419–20n.), the intellectual woman who is virtually identified with a man (446–7). See also nn. on 300–5, 306–13, 310, 311, 434–56 and 649–50.

(d) *Connections between sections effected by thematic or linguistic copulae*

We will discuss two passages by way of illustration.

(i) 60–135

The passage is made up of three sections, 60–81, 82–113 and 114–35, held together by a unifying theme: that *all* Roman women are congenitally unfaithful, and the further up the social ladder one progresses, the more debased that unchastity becomes. Thus, the women appear in ascending order of status, from the actress Thymele (66) and *Aelia pauper* with her

liking for Atellan farce (71–2), to the more upper-class Hispulla, who prefers tragedy (74n.), the wife of Lentulus, a wealthy noble (79–80), Eppia, of senatorial class (82–113), and finally the Empress Messalina (114–32). In the same way, their behaviour is presented as a crescendo of vice, beginning with the likes of Tuccia and Apula who merely become aroused as they watch *pantomimi*, followed by those who suggestively handle the actor's gear during the holidays (67–70), then women who fall in love with actors and have sex with them (71–81), Eppia who elopes with a gladiator, and finally the nymphomaniac Messalina who lowers herself to the level of the humblest prostitute, coupling with anonymous males in a filthy brothel.<sup>83</sup>

Within this overall scheme, further touches give additional cohesion to the various sections of the passage in the shape of 'associative bridging'. The initial setting of the scene in the theatre (61) establishes a theme of both this section (60–81) and the one immediately following, on Eppia (82–113), the preference of women for low-class lovers, especially performers of various sorts. More specifically, the astonishing fact of Eppia's leaving behind the mime Paris (87) not only revisits the theme of women's erotic obsession with stage artistes, but also looks forward to the following one on Messalina: Paris was executed by Domitian in 83 for an alleged amour with another imperial wife, Domitia.<sup>84</sup> At 81, the *murmillo* Euryalus' paternity of the aristocratic Lentulus' 'offspring' prepares for the following passage on Eppia and her gladiator lover Sergius. Additionally, Euryalus bears a name suggestive of surpassing physical charms and youthfulness (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 5.295 *Euryalus forma insignis uiridique iuuenta*), suggesting an ironic contrast with Eppia's gladiator-lover, who is getting on in years and ugly to boot (105–10) and thereby heightening her depravity and perversity. Again, the luxurious bedroom furnishings afforded to her as a baby (88–9) recapitulate the elegance of the 'canopied bed inlaid with tortoise shell' (*testudineo . . . conopeo*) in which the gladiator's bastard is laid (80–1), while it may be relevant to the Egyptian theme which follows that *conopeum*, in its usual sense of mosquito net, was closely associated with that country.

Various themes, too, link the Messalina section with the preceding one. Messalina allegedly had a relationship with a gladiator (Dio Cass. 60.28.2), so that her actions to a degree parallel those of Eppia; the striking *meretrix Augusta* (118) is inspired by the description of Cleopatra as *meretrix*

<sup>83</sup> There is also a concomitant progression from brief descriptions of a variety of women (60–81) to extended narratives focusing on the scandalous behaviour of two individuals, Eppia and Messalina.

<sup>84</sup> Suet. *Dom.* 3, Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 11.7, *Epit. de Caes.* 11.11.

*regina* (n. *ad loc.*),<sup>85</sup> forging a connection with the Egyptian ambience of the Eppia scene and the mention (83) of Cleopatra's ancestor Lagus.

Within 60–135, various sections are rounded off by ring composition. In the Eppia episode, the opening theme of family members left behind (85–6) is resumed in 111–12, while mention of Veiento, Eppia's husband, in the final line (113) balances by ring composition *nupta senatori* at the opening of the section (82). Finally, in the concluding line (132) of the Messalina episode, the description of Claudius' bed as *puluinar* (a couch for the gods) revisits the theme of 115, *riuales deorum*.

(ii) 592–661

In these lines, the rejection by upper-class *matronae* of their primary rôle as nurturers of the *familia* reaches its apogee when they are shown not only refusing to perform their maternal and wifely duties, but as actively destroying their husband's family. In keeping with the pattern seen elsewhere in the Satire, their crimes are catalogued in ascending order of wickedness and violence: they use contraceptives and abortifacients to avoid bearing children (592–601); they introduce supposititious children into the husband's family blood-line (602–9);<sup>86</sup> they use dangerous love-potions on their husbands which drive them mad (610–26); they kill not merely their stepchildren (627–8) but even their own children (629–52); they murder their husbands, at first vicariously (they would change the Alcestis story in favour of their pets should the opportunity arise), then actively, by poison, or more brutally, the sword (652–61).

As well as the correspondences between this passage and the prologue, noted earlier, there are also recurring topics which lend unity to 592–661 as a whole, for instance the use of drugs and potions (595, 611, 616–17, 624–6, 631, 639, 659, 661), adultery/hypersexuality (600, 616, 656); luxury/greed for money (594, 629, 646, 655 *Eriphylae*) and women behaving in a manly way (649–50n.; the use of *ferrum* – a man's weapon – in 660).

In addition to the foregoing, the individual sections of 592–661 are interconnected thematically. The humorous paradox that the unfortunate husband should welcome his wife's recourse to abortifacients (*gaude, infelix* 597), since otherwise he would find himself with a black *heres*, connects this section with the next via the shared theme of extraneous blood introduced into an upper-class family (600–1 and 603–5). And the allusion to the elite Aemilii Scauri (604) similarly prepares for the references to even

<sup>85</sup> Propertius describes Cleopatra as *meretrix regina Canopi* (3.11.39), a phrase reapplied to the queen by Pliny (*HN* 9.119) in such a way as to suggest it had become a set description.

<sup>86</sup> Worse than the previous case, which at least spares the husband an extraneous heir.

more illustrious personages, the imperial family, in the following section (615–26).

Again, in 610–25, the emphasis on *hippomanes* (616–17, 626) allows for a variety of associations and connections. The result of the excessively large (616–17) dose administered to Caligula by his wife was butchery on a grand scale (624–5), an appropriately sinister lead-in to the murderous activities of *matronae* that follow. *Hippomanes* was also associated with *malae nouercae* (Virg. *G.* 3.282–3), whose activities precede those of the murderous *matres* (627–33).

Finally, the use of the multivalent term *uenefica* at 626 to describe Caesonius is significant. Used here in its original sense, ‘employer of love potions’, it points forward to the stepmothers of 627–8: stepmothers were notorious not only for killing their stepsons, as in 627–8, but also for deploying love-potions against them (133–5n.). Other meanings of the word also resonate, providing links both backwards and forwards. In the sense ‘witch’, it recalls the Thessalian *philtrea* mentioned at the beginning of the section (610–11), Thessaly being famously the home of sorceresses. Second, in another of its senses, ‘female poisoner’, it prepares for the allusion to the *nouerca uenefica*, ‘poisoning stepmother’, in the next section (627n.).

Lines 627–33, with their theme of parricide, in turn provide a bridge to the final section. They also anticipate the following section in other ways as well. For instance, *natos de paelice* (627n.) conjures up the figure of Juno, mythical stepmother *par excellence*, thus ascribing by implication a comparable viciousness to the modern-day *nouerca* and preparing for the move into the realm of myth and tragedy at 634–7 and 643–61. The emphasis on the youth of the boys who are the object of their mother’s murderous machinations (*adipata* 631n. and *papas* 633n.) foreshadows the Medea and Procne stories (643–4), which involved maternal killing of young children.

Most importantly, the fabulous scenario of murderous stepmothers and mothers (627n.) prepares the ground for the following suggestion that J.’s Satire has elevated itself to the level of tragedy and myth, where such figures abound. This link is reinforced at the stylistic level: since lines 634–7 allude to both the high style and subject matter characteristic of tragedy (nn. *ad loc.*), the preceding lines on murderous mothers are correspondingly couched in elevated language, which features the dignified periphrases *quibus amplior est res* and *custodite animas*, the tragic circumlocution *illa quae peperit* for ‘mother’ and the pretentious use of *moneo* (629n.).

The example of Pontia (638), a notorious murderess who employs aconite (639), also permits several associations, once more pointing both back and forward. Heraclea Pontica was a notable producer of aconite (Strab. 543, Plin. *HN* 27.4) – purportedly used by stepmothers bent on



murder (Ov. *Met.* 1.147 *lurida terribiles miscent aconita nouercae*), as well as by Medea (*Colchide torua* 643).<sup>87</sup> Additionally, Colchis, home of Medea, was part of the Pontic empire. Finally, the name Pontia provides a link with the ending of the Satire with its allusion to Mithridates' antidotes as *Pontica medicamina* (661).

The final lines of the poem (*at nunc res agitur tenui pulmone rubetae, | sed tamen et ferro, si praegustarit Atrides | Pontica ter uicti cautus medicamina regis*) might seem abrupt, but they are in fact carefully contrived. Not only do they designedly exploit the favourite Juvenalian device of bathos<sup>88</sup> (despite her sophisticated *uenena*, a wife will still resort to cold steel if necessary), but they also connect thematically with what has gone before. The sardonic designation of the husband as *Atrides* links up with the multiple tragic allusions in the final section as a whole. The allusion to Mithridates (*ter uicti... regis* 661) provides a connection not merely with the theme of potions and poisons, prominent throughout the whole final passage (cf. *medicamina* 595 and 661), but also with Medea, notorious for her use of *uenena*, including her attempt to poison her stepson Theseus;<sup>89</sup> furthermore, Mithridates was said to have murdered close relatives (Sall. *Hist.* 2.76 Maur., App. *Mithr.* 112), as do the wives of 627–61. Finally, the concluding two lines bring the Satire to a climax with a last, climactic reversal of gender rôles, as the wife abandons poisons in favour of the more manly *ferrum*,<sup>90</sup> while the husband resorts to drugs – typically associated with women – in a vain attempt to avoid Agamemnon's fate.

\* \* \*

We have attempted to show that a great deal of care has gone into the composition of the Satire. This said, it would be going too far to deny that the structure is loose, especially in the second half, and that, although connections are often made on a thematic and verbal level between sections, not all transitions are equally smooth.

Various reasons have been suggested for the Satire's overall lack of a tight structure: (a) genuine misogyny on J.'s part diverted his attention from care with composition (Courtney); (b) J.'s writing is informed by his chosen genre, which affected a loosely textured discursive style; (c) since J. was writing at a time when poetry was performed as declamation, he

<sup>87</sup> Aconite features in Ovid's account of Medea's attack on her stepson Theseus: see Ov. *Met.* 7.404–20.

<sup>88</sup> A common Juvenalian device. Other examples of bathos at the end of a section: 264, 334, 397, 505–6, 517, 591–2, 654. For a similar abrupt descent cf. the conclusion to the programmatic *Satire* 1.

<sup>89</sup> See n. 87 above.

<sup>90</sup> It is noteworthy that Clytemnestra, with whom the wife is here identified, is said by Aeschylus *Ag.* 11 to have an ἀνδρόβουλον κέαρ.

prefers dazzling individual effects to a neat overall structure; (d) (perhaps closest to the mark) the impression of a chaotic structure is a deliberate ploy on the part of the poet to characterise the Speaker, creating the persona of 'a single-minded obsessive' (Braund 1992a: 83).

To repeat our main point, however: while it would be unrealistic to deny that the Satire at times reads more like a stream of consciousness than an organic whole, we should not go too far in this direction, and dismiss it as an altogether ramshackle, rambling construction.

### 3 JUVENAL'S ANTI-MATRONA

That the *matronae* of *Satire* 6 exhibit masculine characteristics and encroach on traditionally male spheres of activity has often been noted.<sup>91</sup> Less attention has been paid to an important corollary of this, the comprehensive overturning by J.'s wicked wives of key conjugal<sup>92</sup> and female virtues. First among the former is *pudicitia*, which for present purposes may be broadly defined as the restriction of female sexual activity to an exclusively marital context.<sup>93</sup> As the elder Seneca put it (*Contr.* 2.7.9), *feminae quidem unum pudicitia decus est: itaque ei curandum est esse et uideri pudicam*.<sup>94</sup> Numerous epitaphs for Roman wives praise their exemplary chastity;<sup>95</sup> there were shrines to Pudicitia Patricia and Pudicitia Plebeia;<sup>96</sup> Augustus criminalised wifely *impudicitia* as part of his long-lived marriage legislation of 18 BC and AD 9;<sup>97</sup> and marital chastity and fidelity are touted as ideals on imperial coinage.<sup>98</sup> But J.'s *matronae* affront *pudicitia* in every conceivable way:<sup>99</sup> not merely by straightforward adultery (*Sat.* 6 *passim*), but by more exotic variations, which include prostitution in a low brothel (114–32), incest (133–4, 403–4), octogenarian

<sup>91</sup> E.g. Bond 1979: 426–7, 432–3 *et passim*, Anderson 1956: 80–2 = 1982: 262–4, Grazia Battisti 1996: 32–6.

<sup>92</sup> In general on these see Treggiari, *RM* 229–61. See also the spoof address to the 'bride' at Plaut. *Cas.* 815–20.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Langlands 2006: 37–77.

<sup>94</sup> Similarly Sen. *De matrimonio* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovin.* 319c *in hac [pudicitia] muliebrium uirtutum principatus est*; *ibid.* 320a *mulieris proprie uirtus pudicitia est*.

<sup>95</sup> *pudicitia/pudica* ILS 8393 col. 1.30, 8394.27, 8395.4, 8398.2, 8402.2, 8444.4; *castissima* ILS 8441.7, 8450.3; *corpore casto* ILS 7472.2; *castitatis conscia* ILS 1259 right col. 2, Shaw 2002: 213. See also Plaut. *Amph.* 840, Liv. 42.34.3, Sen. *Helv.* 16.3–4, Juv. 6.163–4. Note also the suggestion of Keegan 2008: 2 that the inscription for 'Turia' (ILS 8393) was accompanied by a statue of the *laudata* 'as *palliata* in a *pudicitia*-pose'.

<sup>96</sup> Langlands 2006: 44–52. Cf. 308n.

<sup>97</sup> Gardner 1986: 127–31, Treggiari, *RM* 277–98.

<sup>98</sup> Mattingly 1936, nos. 911–13 (p. 355), 1877–8 (p. 537), and 1899 (p. 540), Hadrianic; Mueller 2002: 25–6, later Empire.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.20 *etiam matronarum multum in libidine magisterium*.

sex (191–9), lesbian couplings before the Altar of Chastity (306–13), contests of erotic dancing (320–6), bestiality (333–4) and sex with specially primed eunuchs (366–78). Their behaviour is summed up in two passages of the Satire: *iamque eadem summis pariter minimisque libido* (349) and the pseudo-Sallustian claptrap of 294–5 *nullum crimen abest facinusque libidinis ex quo | paupertas Romana perit*: indeed Braund has persuasively argued that the sexual immorality of wives is the thematic glue which holds *Satire* 6 together.<sup>100</sup>

Closely related to *pudicitia* was the idea of conjugal *fides*, ‘often associated with sexual loyalty’:<sup>101</sup> cf. *ILS* 7472.6 *casta, pudens, uolgei nescia, feida uiro*. But *fides* had wider ramifications, in the shape of mutual loyalty between husband and wife: cf. *ILS* 7472.3 *fido fida uiro ueixsit studio parili*, Cic. *Fam.* 14.1.1 and the so-called *laudatio Turiae* (*ILS* 8393), which is a study in conjugal faithfulness.<sup>102</sup> In stark contrast to this, Eppia’s actions in sailing off to Egypt with her gladiator-lover, callously abandoning homeland and family (82–113), are a supreme example of conjugal *bad faith*,<sup>103</sup> pointedly overturning the paradigm of the loyal wife who bravely follows her husband into exile or danger, often undertaking a sea voyage in the process.

The cornerstone of a successful union, theorists of marriage opined, was *concordia* (ὁμοφροσύνη), mutual harmony, an ideal summed up in the juristic phrase *bene concordans matrimonium*,<sup>104</sup> celebrated in *elogia* for dead spouses,<sup>105</sup> and embodied iconographically in the *dextrarum iunctio* on funerary monuments for married couples.<sup>106</sup> But *Satire* 6 is arguably a study in marital *disharmony*. *Concordia* is impossible, claims J.’s speaker, if one’s mother-in-law is alive (231); wives pick fights with husbands, provoking mutual recriminations (268–75), claim sexual *carte blanche* (281–5), in short, live in a state of bitter alienation from their husbands (508–11 *nulla uiri cura... | ...uiuit tamquam uicina mariti* etc.), thus negating the ideal whereby an *uxor* exhibited *comitas*, ‘affability’, towards her husband and others,<sup>107</sup> with the consequence that married life was (purportedly)

<sup>100</sup> Braund 1992. <sup>101</sup> Treggiari, *RM* 237.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. *ILS* 8393 col. 1.26 *fidei in nos*, 2.53, 2.55 and, in a similar context, the *singularis fides* of Val. Max. 6.7.2.

<sup>103</sup> Contrast the behaviour of the honorand in *CIL* VI 17690: *d. m. Faeniae Filumen(e), quae pietate co(n)iugi in prouincia(m) peregrinata es(t)*.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. also Mart. 4.13.7 *candida perpetuo reside, Concordia, lecto*; Plin. *Ep.* 4.19.5; Treggiari, *RM* 251–3.

<sup>105</sup> E.g. *ILS* 1259 left col. 11 *simplici concordia*, 8400.5–6, 8401.3 *opsequentes et concordēs*, *ibid.* 5. Cf. Tac. *Agr.* 6.1 *uixeruntque mira concordia, per mutuum caritatem et in uicem se anteponendo*; Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 140e–f; Watson 2008a: 291.

<sup>106</sup> Larsson Lovén 2010.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. *ILS* 8393 col. 1.30 *domestica bona... comitatis, facilitatis*; Plin. *Ep.* 7.19.7 *eadem quam iucunda quam comis, quam denique... non minus amabilis quam ueneranda*;

passed *sine discordia*, *sine lite* or *sine controuersia*, according to the conventional formulations.<sup>108</sup>

The *laudatio Turiae* (ILS 8393) memorialises the honorand's *domestica bona pudicitiae, opsequi, comitatis, facilitatis*,<sup>109</sup> *lanificiis tuis* (col. 1.30). Among these *obsequium* (*morigeratio*),<sup>110</sup> an attitude of submissiveness towards to one's husband, was highly esteemed. Funerary inscriptions testify to the value placed on this in the ledger of matronal virtues.<sup>111</sup> Traditionally it entailed obeying the *uir* in everything,<sup>112</sup> a wife's putting her own interests second to those of her husband,<sup>113</sup> indulging his various foibles<sup>114</sup> and, if need be, putting up with his extramarital flings.<sup>115</sup> But far from observing the paradigm (cf. CLE 1846.10 *dum satis obsequeris, famula dicta uiri*), J.'s wives are grossly insubordinate towards their husbands, altogether the domineering females of anti-marriage polemic.<sup>116</sup> Caesennia exploits her dowry to force her husband to turn a blind eye to her affairs (136–41); Bibula 'reigns' in the marital home so long as her looks hold

ILS 1259 left col. 7 *coniugali gratia*, 8445.3 *cum qua uita iucunda*, 8450.5–7 *quae ita mecum cum summa iucunditate adque simplicitate in diem uitae suae egit quam adfectioni coniugali*; Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 141a–b. The opposite: Eur. *Andr.* 205–6 'your husband hates you because you are not a pleasant person to live with'.

<sup>108</sup> ILS 8443.6 *sine qaerella* (*sic*), 8457 *sine ulla controuersia*, also Plin. *Ep.* 8.5.1, Shaw 2002: 211.

<sup>109</sup> *facilitas* means something like 'being easy or pleasant to be with'; cf. CLE 1136.3–4 *facilis formosa puella | docta opulenta pia casta pudica proba*.

<sup>110</sup> *morigeratio*: Plaut. *Amph.* 842, Catull. 61.144–6, Williams 1958: 19–20, 28–9.

<sup>111</sup> ILS 8394.27, CLE 636.2 *obsequio pietatis superasti maritu*, CIL VI 37965.15 *obsequioque prior nulla*, VIII 23808.5–7 *feminae marito obsequentissimae*, Kroll 1914–16: 281, Williams 1958: 24–5, Shaw 2002: 213 *obsequentissima*. Cf. also Plat. *Meno* 71e. Davies 2010: 197 suggests that the right-hand position occupied by the woman in handclasp (*dextrarum iunctio*) scenes on funerary monuments for married couples is one of inferiority (as opposed to dominance).

<sup>112</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.25.5 (Romulus' marriage law). Treggiari, *RM* 238–61 argues that the subordination of wife to husband had been significantly modified in the post-Ciceronian period: but J., who creates a rigidly old-fashioned *persona* and is writing in a misogynistic tradition which accused wives of dominating their husbands, will have none of this.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. ILS 1259 right col. 3 *sibi maritum praeferens*, CLE 492.14 *et uellet quae uellem, nollet quoque ac si ego nollem*. The epitaphic phrase *bene merens*, indicating that a spouse has done what he or she was expected to do (Nielsen 1997: 179–85), if applied to a wife, indicates that she exhibited due subservience and compliance towards her husband: cf. ILS 8437 d. m. *Octauiae Crescentinae quae antiqua uita uixit, fidei ac diligentiae [gr]auiss. C. Val. Ianuarius coniux... b.m. fecit*.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. [Aristotle] *Oec.* 3.1 (p. 37 van Groningen and Wartelle) *arbitrari decet uere compositam mulierem uiri mores uitae suae legem imponi, a deo sibi impositos... quos equidem si patienter et humiliter ferat, facile reget domum*; Naumachius Stob. 4.571 lines 16–21; 'Periktione', cited next n.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 204–6, *Men.* 787–802; 'Periktione the Pythagorean' Stob. 4.692; further 281–3n.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. 30, 136–41, 142–6onn., further Edmunds 1992.

up (149n.;<sup>117</sup> cf. 224); another wife (219–23) demands on a whim the crucifixion of a slave, brushing aside her spouse's demands that she supply a reason for her actions, since she 'orders her husband about' (224 *imperat ergo uiro*); while yet another imposes on the household in defiance of her husband's wishes a crew of effeminates whose epicene appearance belies their adulterous proclivities (O fr.); and late in the poem, a further wife uses magic to reduce her husband to a condition of imbecilic malleability (610–13). It is also in conformity with this pattern of wifely tyranny that, whereas an *uxor* was legally under the control of her husband,<sup>118</sup> here (212–18) he must get her permission to engage in financial transactions.

The respective duties of husband and wife were influentially demarcated as early as Xenophon.<sup>119</sup> A key wifely task was stewardship of the marital home and its finances,<sup>120</sup> an idea articulated in epitaphic formulations such as *domum seruauit, bona seruatrix, conseruat(rix), custos peculi; et fruct]ui meis haec fuit [negotiis, | domus] diuitiae, curam... [ege]rit*<sup>121</sup> with, as a corollary, the belief that the good wife would augment the property of the marital home<sup>122</sup> and oversee domestic outlays with due circumspection (*frugi*,<sup>123</sup> *parsimonio [sic] fulta*<sup>124</sup> etc.). But far from exercising financial restraint, J.'s *matronae* exploit their erotic capital to squander their husband's wealth (149–60, 206–11), throw away money until their resources are practically exhausted (352–65) or simply spend without regard to the ruinous financial consequences (508–11 *nulla... mentio fiet / damnum... grauis est rationibus*).

A central purpose of Roman – as of Greek – marriage was the production of legitimate children,<sup>125</sup> an idea captured in the derivation of *matrimonium* and *matrona* from *mater*. It was in the light of this that 'Turia', distrusting her fertility, offered to divorce her husband so that he could have children by another (*ILS* 8393 col. 2.41–9). Augustus, in promoting his marital legislation, asked, 'is there anything better than a wife who

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.33 *nunc uinclis exolutis domos... regerent [mulieres]*.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. Liv. 34.2.11, *Dig.* 24.3.66.1, Cracco Ruggini 1989: 606–7, Dixon 2001: 73–88.

<sup>119</sup> *Oec.* 7.14–43. <sup>120</sup> Pearce 1974.

<sup>121</sup> *ILS* 8403.8, 8440.4, *CIL* XI 6286.5–7, *CLE* 1887.4–5; cf. also Peek, *Gr. Versinschr.* 2040.29.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. *CLE* 2107A.5–6 *quaeq. penum paruosq. lares prouexerit illi, | dum frugi uitam degerit ingenio*, 1429.6 *creueruntque mei te moderante lares*, *CLE* 635.2, 636.3 *omnia quae sunt nobis, tuo sunt quaesita labore*, Pearce 1974: 25 n. 25, Semon. fr. 7.85 W.

<sup>123</sup> E.g. *ILS* 8398.1, 8402.2, 8444.5; *CLE* 1441.1. Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 4.19.2 (one of his wife Calpurnia's virtues was *summa frugalitas*).

<sup>124</sup> *CLE* 516.2. Cf. *CLE* 492.17 *parca manu set larga meo in amore mariti*; Lysias 1.7, a good wife was 'a clever and frugal steward of the household and managed everything with precision'.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. 38n.

is modest, domestic, a good manager *and childbearer?*' (Dio Cass. 56.3.3), while a husband's epitaph for his wife praises her as *fecunda*, a virtue often celebrated in wives.<sup>126</sup> But J.'s upper-class *matronae* trample upon this ideal by resorting to abortifacients (thereby, according to the jurists, depriving a father of his legal right to an heir),<sup>127</sup> by smuggling into the household supposititious babies (592–609), or – if they do indeed give birth – presenting their husbands with a miniaturised replica of a gladiator or black African (80–1, 599–601),<sup>128</sup> in outrageous violation of the dictum that a wife's chastity was attested by the physical resemblance of her offspring to her husband.<sup>129</sup> They also have intercourse with eunuchs in order to avoid pregnancy (366–8). Worst of all, they do not baulk at filicide for the sake of financial gain (629–52).

The husband of 'Turia' asserts *rara sunt tam diuturna matrimonia finita morte, non diuertio interrupta* (ILS 8393 col. 1.27), a claim which Kajanto and Shaw<sup>130</sup> dismiss as tendentious. It is nonetheless grounded in a characteristically Roman belief, that matronal chastity in its most exemplary form involved marriage to only one man, so-called *uniuiratus*, precluding the possibility of divorce or remarriage following the death of a spouse.<sup>131</sup> The concept has a notable presence in literary texts (Carthaginian Dido is made to subscribe to it by Virgil and it is memorably spoofed by Martial),<sup>132</sup> but is above all richly attested in funerary epitaphs from a wide range of periods, where it appears in formulations such as *uniuiria, uno contenta marito, uni deuota marito, unum sortita maritum | seruauit casta pudorem* and *Celsino nupta uniuiura unianimis*.<sup>133</sup> J.'s wives, however, engage in serial marriages of exceedingly short duration, totting up 'eight husbands in five autumns', a fine thing, says the poet sarcastically, to have inscribed on your tombstone (229–30) – and a kind of conjugal leapfrog that was typical, according to Plutarch, of rich, spoiled women (*Eroticus* 752f).

<sup>126</sup> ILS 8452.18–19. Cf. also ILS 8403.5, Liv. 42.34.3–4, Sen. *Helv.* 16.3, Tac. *Ann.* 1.41.2 *insigni fecunditate*, Juv. 6.162.

<sup>127</sup> Dig. 47.11.4, 48.19.39. Note also the speech declaimed by Corvus *de ea, quae apud matronas disserebat liberos non esse tollendos, et ob hoc accusatur rei publicae laesae* (Sen. *Suas.* 2.21).

<sup>128</sup> Relevant here is the derivation of *adulterium* from *ad* + *alter* (Papin. Dig. 48.5.6.1 *proprie adulterium in nupta committitur, propter partum ex altero conceptum composito nomine*).

<sup>129</sup> See 81n., also Peek, *Gr. Versinschr.* 2040.27.

<sup>130</sup> Kajanto 1969, Shaw 2002: 234–41.

<sup>131</sup> The essence of the concept is captured by Valerius Maximus, 2.1.3 *quae uno contentae matrimonio fuerant corona pudicitiae honorabantur: existimabant enim eum praecipue matronae sincera fide incorruptum esse animum qui depositae uirginitatis cubile egredi nesciret, multorum matrimoniorum quasi legitimae cuiusdam intemperantiae signum esse credentes*. See further Williams 1958: 23–4; Lightman and Zeisel 1977.

<sup>132</sup> Williams 1958: 23–4, Mart. 10.63.

<sup>133</sup> CIL VI 25392, CLE 643.5, 736.3, 1306.4, 1523.7–8.

The ideal *matrona* was ‘a stay-at-home’,<sup>134</sup> and, if she exited the house, modest and restrained in public: cf. Tac. *Ann.* 13.45.3 *rarus in publicum egressus*, CLE 237 *hic sita est Amymone Marci optima et pulcherrima, / lanifica pia pudica frugi casta domiseda*<sup>135</sup> and 8403.8 *domum seruauit, lanam fecit*, implying alike ‘she managed the household’ and ‘she kept to the house’ (OLD *seruo* 3a), while engaged on *lanificium*, a traditional marker of female virtue, in the sense that it kept *matronae* busily occupied and hence out of mischief.<sup>136</sup> By contrast, Messalina nightly exits the imperial palace to freelance in a brothel (114–32); other upper-class *matronae* behave with gross immodesty in a public arena (300–13), flit all over the city, with shameless effrontery waylaying generals or spreading the latest gossip (398–412), or proceed in a noisy train to the dubious nocturnal pleasures of bath, exercise and sensual massage (419–23).

Some traditional convictions about marital proprieties, albeit not core values of the institution, also call for brief discussion, since these too are systematically dismantled by J.’s monstrous women. A wife of good family, it was thought, should marry within her own social stratum:<sup>137</sup> J.’s *matronae* prefer lower-class lovers – actors, musicians, athletes, slaves and gladiators (73–81, 82–113, 114–32, 279, 331–2, 355–6, O20–34, 366–78, 379–97, 598–601). A wife should be wealthy and bring a dowry which could be used to help her husband’s career:<sup>138</sup> but in 136–41 an *uxor dotata* exploits her dowry to behave simply as she likes. Ideally a wife will be beautiful:<sup>139</sup> here such beauty is ruthlessly exploited by a bride in order to indulge every expensive whim (143–60).<sup>140</sup> A modest *matrona* should not use artificial aids to beauty:<sup>141</sup> the wife of 457–507 is reprehensibly

<sup>134</sup> Note the revealing claim in Plaut. *Men.* 821–2 that, if a wife leaves the house without her husband’s knowledge, this gives him grounds to divorce her, a statement which, McDonnell 1983: 58–9 suggests, reflects Roman legal practice of the time.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. also Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.94; Liv. 34.2.9–12, *ibid.* 4.18; Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 139c; Stob. 4.580–1, 592–3.

<sup>136</sup> Maurin 1983: 140, Larsson Lovén 1998, Hersch 2010b; below 289–90n.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. ILS 8394.13–14, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.82–6, Treggiari, *RM* 89–90.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Plaut. *Most.* 281, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.86, Juv. 6.162, CLE 1136.4 *opulenta*, Plut. *Cic.* 41.3–4, Treggiari, *RM* 95–7, Grazia Battisti 1996: 29–30.

<sup>139</sup> ILS 8402.1 *pulcherrima*, 8403.2, CLE 995A 5, 1307.6, Mart. 1.10.3, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.85–6, Juv. 6.162, Tac. *Ann.* 15.59.5, Plut. *Ant.* 87.3; Kleiner 1987: 551–2 and Riess 2012: 494–5 for further celebrations of a female partner’s beauty in the epigraphic and monumental record.

<sup>140</sup> Contrast CLE 1303, for Tarquinia Modesta, *nam fuit eximia specie miroque decore, | mens inerat uere corpore digna suo*.

<sup>141</sup> ILS 8393 col. 1.31 *ornatus non conspiciendi, cultus modici*, CIL VI 37965.9 *munda domi, sat munda foras*, Sen. *Contr.* 2.7.3 *matrona...prodeat in tantum ornata quantum ne immunda sit*, Sen. *Helv.* 16.3–4, Grillet 1975: 97–106, Rosati on Ov. *MF* 11–16, Watson 2008a: 278.

*culta*, employing jewellery, make-up and elaborate hairstyles in the service of adultery (464–5 *ad moechum lota ueniunt cute. quando uideri | uult formonsa domi? moechis foliata parantur*, 488–91). According to traditionalists, women should observe a modest taciturnity, speaking only to second their husbands: instances include Plut. *Comp. Lyc. et Num.* 3.5 ‘Numa accustomed [wives] to keep silent’, the elder Cato’s fulminations *qui hic mos est [mulierum] in publicum procurrendi... et uiros alienos appellandi?* (Liv. 34.2.9) and *CIL* VI 37965.11 *exiguo sermone irreprehensa manebat*, cf. Gilleland 1980: 182 n. 15.<sup>142</sup> But nowadays, complains J., women plead cases (242–5) in defiance of *condicio naturae [femineae] et uerecundia stolae* (Val. Max. 8.3 *praef.*);<sup>143</sup> the wife of 397–412 openly addresses men of affairs in her husband’s presence and spreads rumours throughout the city: the bluestocking of 434–56 thrusts her literary and rhetorical expertise upon all, drowning out other speakers and affronting another cherished belief of traditionalists, that women should not be over-educated.<sup>144</sup>

Both funerary inscriptions and protreptics on marriage attest the conviction that wives should play a rôle in traditional religion: cf. *ILS* 1259 left col. 2 *dicata templis atq. amica numinum*, 8393 col. 1.30–1 *religionis sine superstitione*<sup>145</sup> and in particular Plutarch, *Prae. coniug.* 140d ‘it is proper for a wife to worship and to recognise only the gods in whom her husband believes and for the door to be shut to strange cults and foreign superstitions’. But in explicit contrast to this, the wife of 511–47 throws her doors open to practitioners of all kinds of foreign creeds, while in the earlier Bona Dea scene (314–45) upper-class *matronae*, far from ‘eschewing orgiastic rites... which take place in house... for these lead to inebriation and ecstasies of soul’ (‘Phintys the Pythagorean’, Stob. 4.593), turn the December ritual of the goddess, held in the home of a senior magistrate, into a no-holds-barred drunken orgy.

One final point may be noted in this connection which, while not central to the ideology of marriage, relates to received notions of female propriety and thus bears indirectly upon matronal behaviour. A long-standing prohibition, relaxed somewhat in later times, forbade the consumption of wine to women,<sup>146</sup> in the conviction that this led to licentious

<sup>142</sup> See additionally the talkative wife of Liban. *Or.* 26, of whom it is said (12) ‘things were indeed turned upside down: the husband was silent, the wife kept prattling’, and 438–43n.

<sup>143</sup> Cf. also *Dig.* 3.1.1.5 *secundo loco edictum proponitur in eos, qui pro aliis ne postulent* (‘were not to make application on behalf of others’): *in quo edicto exceptit praetor sexum et casum... sexum: dum feminas prohibet pro aliis postulare. et ratio quidem prohibendi, ne contra pudicitiam sexui congruentem alienis causis se immisceant, ne uirilibus officiis fungantur mulieres. origo uero introducta est a Carfania improbissima femina.*

<sup>144</sup> Cf. intro. 46.

<sup>145</sup> Further *ILS* 8444.4, 8445.4, *CLE* 158.2, Plaut. *Amph.* 841 *deum metum*.

<sup>146</sup> Minieri 1982.



behaviour.<sup>147</sup> J.'s *matronae*, however, imbibe to great excess, leading not just to the sexual licence that the embargo on drinking sought to prevent, but to extremes of perversion (300–13, 300n., 314–34).<sup>148</sup>

#### 4 MISOGYNY IN LITERATURE

Irrespective of whether *Satire* 6 is a satire against women or against marriage,<sup>149</sup> it is, beyond question, profoundly coloured by a Graeco-Roman tradition of misogyny which built up a litany of stock complaints against the female sex.<sup>150</sup> J.'s debt to such misogynistic themes has been extensively exemplified in the commentary. But the corpus of writings from which these are drawn deserves analysis in its own right, partly because of the differing emphases adopted by each and subsequently reflected in J., partly because certain topics are omitted by J. in a way that helps clarify the primary focus of his attack, lastly because he introduces a number of misogynistic themes which are specific to the cultural landscape of Rome.

At the fountainhead of the 'remarkably homogeneous'<sup>151</sup> Greek discourse about women stand Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. In two accounts of the first woman, *Theog.* 507–616 and *Works* 42–105, Hesiod depicts females as irresistibly alluring to men but also ruinous (*Theog.* 585, 589, *Days* 78), shameless (cf. *Juv.* 284–5) and intrinsically deceitful (*Works* 67, 78, also 373–5), in sum an 'evil' (*Theog.* 570 etc.), but a necessary one (*Theog.* 602–12).<sup>152</sup> In addition, women are lustful, making unwanted sexual demands (*Works* 586–7), a theme which finds many later echoes. Notoriously too, Hesiod spoke of the 'race of women' (*Theog.* 590–1), making them a separate species from men,<sup>153</sup> and characterised them as a poverty-inducing, unproductive burden on the household (*Theog.* 590–602): ideas perhaps reflected in *Juv.* 6.359–62 *tamen utile quid sit | prospiciunt aliquando uiri, frigusque famemque | formica tandem quidam expauere magistra: | prodiga non sentit pereuntem femina censum*.

The next work of note is Semonides' 'Satire against Women' (fr. 7 W).<sup>154</sup> In it the poet assimilated wives to ten different kinds of

<sup>147</sup> For morally flavoured disapprobation of women drinking cf. *CLE* 548.4 *sobria, non moecha*, *ILS* 8452.4 *sobr.*, *Sen. Ep.* 95.20–1, Braund 1992a: 73 n. 16.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. also the disgusting behaviour of the *matrona* at 425–33.

<sup>149</sup> On this question see intro. § 2.

<sup>150</sup> Useful summaries of the tradition in Highet 1954: 264–5 and Gold 1994: 106–7. For the Greek side in particular see Loraux 1993.

<sup>151</sup> Loraux 1993: 106, further 106–10.

<sup>152</sup> On this deeply rooted Greek idea see Loraux 1993: 72–3. For its Roman correlate see below, with n. 173.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. Loraux 1993. For the idea see also Semon. fr. 7.1 W, if so interpreted (cf. Loraux 1993: 90).

<sup>154</sup> Semonides' precise date is uncertain: mid to late seventh century BC appears most likely.

animal or natural force (vixen, bitch, sea etc.) and imputed to these a range of vices, which became misogynistic stocks-in-trade – nosiness, irascibility, loquacity, greediness, promiscuity, excess of sexual appetite, vanity, scheming. But, significantly, he allows (83–93) that there is one ideal kind of wife, the bee-woman: ‘the man who marries her is fortunate’ (83; cf. 92–3).<sup>155</sup> J.’s speaker, however, disallows any such possibility: even the most exemplary of Roman *matronae*, Cornelia the mother of the Gracchi, is insufferable because of her aristocratic *hauteur*, and the perfect mate is dismissed as *nigro... simillima cycno*, non-existent (161–9). The contrast between the two, the refusal to admit a single exception to the universal badness, helps stamp J.’s speaker as a diehard misogynist, whom no woman can satisfy.

The rhetoric of misogyny is well represented in Attic tragedy, especially Euripides.<sup>156</sup> Arguably the best evidence for this is the great quantity of misogynistic remarks excerpted from his plays, mainly lost ones, by the anthologist Stobaeus for his two chapters *On marriage* and *Advice to those intending to marry*.<sup>157</sup> A number find echoes in *Satire* 6 or otherwise call for comment. Fr. 464 Kannicht reads ‘marry now, marry, and then die either by poison or treachery at a woman’s hand!’; cf. the husband-poisoner of Juv. 659–61. Some of Stobaeus’ quotations rehearse the accusation that women are naturally scheming and untrustworthy (*Andr.* 85, *IT* 1032, *Med.* 408–9, fr. 321), a constant refrain in *Satire* 6 (231–6, 271–8, O20–34, 629–33); others the charge that women are impossible to guard (frs. 111, 320, 1061 and 1063; cf. Juv. O31–4), are prone to carping and verbal abuse (*Phoen.* 198–201; cf. Juv. 268–71) or sexual intemperance (*Andr.* 943–53), a pervasive theme of the *Satire*. Others again voice undiluted misogyny: they include frs. 36, 498, 546 (a wife, even one with a good reputation, is worse than the worst of husbands), 1059 Kannicht (of all evils women are the worst)<sup>158</sup> and *Andr.* 269–73. None of these can, however, compare in scope or virulence with the tirade against womankind pronounced by Hippolytus (*Hipp.* 616–68), who compares them to ‘counterfeit coin, outwardly good, inwardly bad’ (Barrett on 616) and complains that, with their husbands’ acquiescence, they drain the coffers of the household by expenses on useless finery (630–3), a charge repeated in Juv. 152–60. Hippolytus too is especially severe on clever females (640–4), an attitude which resurfaces in Juv. 434–56.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. also the more equivocal Hes. *Works* 702–3 ‘for a man carries off no better thing than a good wife and conversely nothing more chilling than a bad one’.

<sup>156</sup> Doubtless a factor in creating Euripides’ reputation for hostility to the female sex with which Aristophanes makes such play in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (cf. also *Lys.* 283–4, 368–9).

<sup>157</sup> Stob. 4.22–3. The first of these significantly incorporates a long subsection on ψόγος γυναικῶν, ‘censure of women’.

<sup>158</sup> For women as an evil see also the references in Loraux 1993: 72–3.

The uncompromising extremism of Hippolytus' diatribe, his remark 'I will never cease from hating women, not even if someone says I constantly harp on the subject' (664–5), prompts comparisons with J.'s satiric speaker – with the crucial distinction that the latter attacks the women of contemporary Rome and speaks in a spirit of comic hyperbole, not bitter hatred. Nonetheless, the reductiveness and one-sidedness of the Speaker's arguments is profitably thrown into relief if one brings into play a further observation of Euripides which occurs several times in Stobaeus' *On marriage* and *Advice to those intending to marry*: that not all women are cut from the same cloth and that the bad ones unjustifiably bring the good ones into disrepute (frs. 493, 494 Kannicht, *Hecuba* 1183–6).<sup>159</sup> But such a position J.'s speaker will not for a moment entertain: for him all women are irredeemably vicious.

In Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*, Mica complains that Euripides has besmirched the entire sex as 'lover-keepers, man-mad, wine-drinkers, betrayers, chatterboxes, utterly unwholesome, a great evil to men' (392–4). Here we see invective against women beginning to harden into stereotypes which subsequently enjoy a long career in writers of many genres.<sup>160</sup> For Euripides' accusations are duly 'proved' by the actions and unabashed admissions of the women themselves in the Aristophanic plays which are richest in comic invective against females, *Lysistrata*, *Ecclesiazusae* and *Thesmophoriazusae*. The women of the first two are characterised throughout as sex-mad and bibulous, with gibes *en passant* at female loquacity (*Lys.* 356, *Eccl.* 120), capacity for trickery (*Eccl.* 237–8) and mischief (*Lys.* 12). But it is in *Thesmophoriazusae* that fullest rein is given to humorous abuse of women, who, in addition to the just-noted appetites, are several times accused of *suppositio partus* (cf. Juv. 602–9) and taking lovers, a key theme of *Satire* 6.

Beyond this, however, there are resemblances between *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Satire* 6 which makes one suspect that J. drew directly on Aristophanes' play, as he did with Eupolis' *Baptae* for the cross-dressing *orgia* of *Satire* 2. To begin with, the play is set at an all-female ritual, the *Thesmophoria*, broadly speaking the Greek equivalent of the Roman festival of Bona Dea, also restricted to women and the centrepiece of *Satire* 6 (314–45). And in both cases the rite is penetrated by a man in drag, the Relative in the play, the historical figure of Clodius in J. (336–45). Drink is a major preoccupation of Aristophanes' female celebrants (630–3, 733–8);<sup>161</sup> J.'s

<sup>159</sup> Cf. also intro. § 5 *ad fin.*

<sup>160</sup> For numerous instances of these and other stock complaints against perceived female shortcomings see Watson 2008a: 273–5.

<sup>161</sup> 733–8 are a parody of Euripides' *Telephus* in which the kidnapped baby turns out to be a wineskin.

women reel with drunken lust (315–19). The Relative claims before the assembled women (and his charge goes un rebutted) that ‘we get banged by slaves and mule-tenders, if we haven’t got anyone else’ (491–2). J. looks to have trumped this at 331–4 where, in the absence of servile lovers, and failing all else (333–4), women are mounted by an ass. Further, the Relative notes in defence of Euripides that he failed to mention how ‘another woman made her husband bite the dust with an axe, or how another drove him mad with drugs’ (560–1),<sup>162</sup> which recalls the final lines of *Satire* 6 and 610–26 respectively. As for J.’s claim *occurrent multae tibi Belides atque Eriphylae | mane, Clytemestram nullus non uicus habebit* (655–6), this localises to Rome a comic accusation<sup>163</sup> which seemingly made its first appearance in *Thesmo.* 549–51 ‘I know the reason [why Euripides’ tragedies feature countless Melanippes and Phaedras but no Penelopes];<sup>164</sup> you couldn’t name a single Penelope among today’s women – they’re all Phaedras!’ Lastly, it may be that the desecration of the altar of Pudicitia by two female revellers directly before the Bona Dea scene owes something to the woman who, ventriloquised by the Relative, ‘bending over, is screwed, holding onto the laurel tree, next to Apollo’s pillar’: a comparable violation of the taboo on sexual intercourse in a sacred space.<sup>165</sup>

While in the authors just examined a conjugal framework is tacitly assumed or, in some cases, spelled out, in Middle and New Comedy the rhetoric of misogyny turns overtly misogynic: to a far greater degree than before the miseries of married life are trumpeted or the sheer insufferability of wives asserted. To cite a few representative Greek instances, Anaxandrides, fr. 53 K–A begins, tautologically, ‘whoever decides to marry, decides wrongly, in that he decides to marry’, before launching into a tirade about wifely tyranny, a charge which is particularly characteristic of later comedy, repeated for example by Alexis, fr. 150 K–A and Men. fr. 219 K–A, who both add complaints about wifely bad temper and propensity to pick fights with a husband (cf. Juv. 6.268–75).

In Roman New Comedy too it is generally wives who bear the brunt of misogynistic attacks and jokes.<sup>166</sup> In Plautus’ *Aulularia*, for instance, an old man, Megadorus, is urged by his sister to marry for his own good. It would indeed be to his advantage, he retorts, if he died first (154: cf. the advice to Postumus that it would be better to commit suicide than marry, Juv.

<sup>162</sup> For *pharmaka* cf. also *Thesmo.* 430, where one of the methods mooted for killing Euripides is poison.

<sup>163</sup> For a catalogue of bad women in a serious context cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 585–638.

<sup>164</sup> See further 655n.

<sup>165</sup> For another possible source of the scene, this time Roman, see 306–13n.

<sup>166</sup> There are occasional misogynistic remarks about women in general (e.g. *Aul.* 124–6 on the universality of female loquacity: *multum loquaces merito omnes habemur; | nec mutam profecto repertam nullam esse | aut hodie dicunt mulierem aut ullo in saeculo*).

6.30–3).<sup>167</sup> Plautine wives are almost invariably portrayed unfavourably: they are spendthrifts and given to luxury (e.g. *Aul.* 168–9 *eburata uehicle, pallas, purpuram | nil moror, quae in seruitutem sumptibus redigunt uiros*; cf. below 352–65n.), talkative (*Cas.* 498; cf. below 190n.) and shrewish and argumentative (e.g. *Cas.* 317–20, *Men.* 765–74; cf. below 268–9n.). Another feature of Plautus' wives, echoed in *Juv.* 6, is their portrayal as sexual beings: even the paragon Alcmena enjoys a night of love-making with her 'husband' and laments his absence (*Amphitr.* 637–40). Often, as in *J.* (36–7n.), this too is given a negative spin, in that the wife is unreasonably<sup>168</sup> jealous that her husband sleeps with a mistress rather than herself (cf. *Asin.* 874 *fundum alienum arat, incultum familiarem deserit*), or else her sexual demands are irksome to her husband (e.g. *Most.* 703–9).<sup>169</sup> Although most commonly the behaviours just noted stem from her being an *uxor dotata* whose dowry allows her to dominate her husband (e.g. *Asin.* 87 *argentum accepi, dote imperium uendidi*, *Aul.* 534–5, *Men.* 76; cf. below 136–41n.), sometimes the disagreeableness of the wives to their husbands is keyed to their mature years.<sup>170</sup> For example, in the *Asinaria*, a wife's fetid breath is contrasted by her husband with the sweet breath of his young *meretrix* (893–5). The most striking identification of *uxores dotatae* with older women comes in the *Mostellaria*, where there is mention of *uetulae edentulae* who apply make-up to mask their physical flaws, the combination of sweat and unguent rendering them foul-smelling (*Most.* 274–8), provoking the comment that the truth of the statement can be attested by those members of the audience *quibus anus domi sunt uxores, quae uos dote meruerunt* (281).<sup>171</sup>

The next author to command our attention is the second-century BC satirist Lucilius, whom *J.* claims as his inspiration in the programmatic *Satire* 1. There is a great deal about sex in Lucilius, along with a number of crudely anatomical remarks about the female body and criticisms of female rapacity,<sup>172</sup> standard fare in the misogynistic literature of Greece

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Antiphanes, fr. 220 K–A, who flatly equates marriage with death.

<sup>168</sup> Cf. *Asin.* 942–7, the final lines of the play, in which the complicit audience's indulgence is craved for a wayward old man. In *Men.* 790–805 a wife's father is only sympathetic to his daughter's complaints about her husband's infidelity when she accuses the husband of stealing her property to give to his *meretrix*.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. *Men.* fr. 296.9–10 K–A.

<sup>170</sup> The majority of *matronae* are mature women, married to a *senex*, and often with a grown son.

<sup>171</sup> Later in the play, the old man Simo's rich wife is represented as repulsive to him as a bedfellow because of her behaviour, but she is also described as an *anus*. In *Aulularia* the *uxor dotata* and 'old wife' themes are again combined when the elderly bachelor Megadorus refuses to marry a middle-aged rich woman who will have all the faults of the *uxor dotata*, but has his sights set on a young virgin without a large dowry (162–74).

<sup>172</sup> For this last cf. frs. 682–5 and 894 Marx.

and Rome. But Lucilius is talking for the most part about *meretrices*, whereas J.'s remit is with wives. This said, there are significant thematic overlaps between the two satirists. In particular, frs. 678–9 *homines ipsi hanc sibi molestiam*<sup>173</sup> *ultro atque aerumnā offerunt, | ducunt uxores, producunt, quibus haec faciant, liberos* and 686 Marx treat marriage and the production of children as self-inflicted misery and as madness, a stance very similar to J.'s (28–9, 38–9). Fr. 730 deals with the topic of wifely domination of a husband,<sup>174</sup> a recurrent complaint of J.'s speaker. Frs. 504–5 anticipate the charge, made at Juv. 464–6, that wives are indifferent about their appearance before their husbands and only beautify themselves for the benefit of actual or prospective lovers, while 992–4 seemingly deal with some of the excuses invented by wives to get out of the house when up to no good, a theme touched on in Juv. 235–8. Frs. 282–3 read *uetulam atque uirosam | uxorem caedam potius quam castrem egomet me*, rolling into one two favourite themes of invective against women, the intemperance of the female sexual appetite and the physical unattractiveness of ladies of mature years.

In exploring Roman invective against women, Richlin 1984: 67 singled out a number of Latin writers apart from J., including Plautus and Terence, Catullus, Horace (*Epodes* 8 and 12 and *Satires* 1), Ovid (*Ars*), Petronius, the *Priapea*, Martial and Apuleius (*Metamorphoses*). There is no room to explore these here, partly for reasons of space, partly to avoid repetition: not only have the texts in question been referred to extensively in the commentary, but for the most part they merely reiterate hostile stereotypes of women already identified in the authors considered above.

This said, Richlin's central argument, that Roman attacks on women are very often animated by seeming revulsion towards the female body (either per se or on account of age), demands further consideration, as it suggests an important point of differentiation from J. It will be helpful first to illustrate by a few select instances what Richlin had in mind, before addressing J.'s deviation from that pattern. A speaker in Lucilius sneers that the celebrated beauties of myth might have had physical shortcomings such as breasts which drooped to belly or groin (540–6),<sup>175</sup> Lucretius jeers at the hypochorisms whereby lovers blind themselves to their girlfriends' various bodily defects (4.1153–69) and mocks the 'revolting' vaginal fumigations of the beauty (1.174–6), while, in *Epode* 8, Horace describes with a wealth of repugnant detail the decayed sexual parts of a γραῦς καπρῶσα, 'randy old

<sup>173</sup> The language here echoes that used by Q. Metellus Macedonicus in 131 BC in urging marriage as a regrettable procreative necessity (Gell. *NA* 1.6.3).

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Edmunds 1992.

<sup>175</sup> For a similarly unkind, body-focused remark, cf. Lucil. 282–3 Marx (quoted above).

woman'. Finally, Martial, who loves to dilate on the disappearance of erotic allure in superannuated females, devotes nearly thirty lines to cataloguing the extreme age and physical unattractiveness of the meaningfully named Vetustilla, whose unseasonable lust drives her to marry, provoking the poet to the startling conclusion *intrare in istum sola fax* [funeral torch] *potest cunnum*.<sup>176</sup>

These examples are merely a few among many, but, although perfectly aware of this strand of the misogynistic tradition,<sup>177</sup> J. for the most part excludes it from *Satire* 6. To be sure, the women of the sixth Satire are portrayed as intensely sexual creatures, and there are various unpleasant animadversions on female corporeality and bodily emanations (the hypertrophied maternal breasts of 9, the streams of urine 309–10, the torrents of vaginal fluid 318–19,<sup>178</sup> the woman who vomits in front of guests and husband 429–33). This said, J. does not exhibit anything like the same level of disgust towards the female body and women's sexual organs (vagina, anus, female odours, menstrual emissions) that we find in Horace's *Epodes*, Martial, the *Priapea* (or even in the likes of Seneca<sup>179</sup>): texts upon which Richlin concentrated in her above-mentioned study of male-authored hostility and unease towards the physiology of the human female. J.'s primary focus in *Satire* 6 is on the *behavioural*, not physical, shortcomings of wives, who are of all ages: this is partly a function of his genre, satire, as opposed to iambus or epigram, with their tendency to extreme verbal and contextual crudity. Significantly, even in 184–99, where an 85-year-old woman is attacked for her use of sexually arousing Greek endearments, it is not primarily her bodily repulsiveness which offends the poet, but the *inappropriateness* of her actions in one of her advanced years. In short, what is focalised in *Satire* 6 is not women's bodies, but all the behaviours – not least their expropriation of masculine rôles – that make them insufferable as marriage partners.<sup>180</sup>

There was in Antiquity a prolific popular-philosophical tradition<sup>181</sup> on the subject of marriage and the related one of household management:

<sup>176</sup> Cf. also the Plautine and Lucilian instances noted earlier.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. the sneer of *Sat.* 1.38–9 *optima summi | nunc uia processus, uetulae uesica beatae*.

<sup>178</sup> For the detail, cf. the gratuitous slur *Juv.* 10.321–2 *quid enim ulla negauerit udis | inguinibus?* and 11.186–8.

<sup>179</sup> Cf. *Ep.* 87.16 *Natalis, tam improbae linguae quam impurae, in cuius ore feminae purgabantur*, also *Cic. Dom.* 25.

<sup>180</sup> We accordingly regard as something of an oversimplification the claim of Gold 1998: 375 'women, then, are characterised in Juvenal as embodying deception and fluidity and as associated with corporeality' (our italics), at least as far as *Satire* 6 is concerned.

<sup>181</sup> For the centrality of the topic of marriage to philosophy see Watson 2008a: 277.

a tradition which was early on domesticated at Rome.<sup>182</sup> Its representatives include Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, Plutarch's *Coniugalia praecepta*, Seneca's *De matrimonio*, several fragmentarily preserved neo-Pythagorean treatments of the topic, Theophrastus' *De nuptiis* as excerpted in Jerome's *Adversus Iovinianum* and lastly the substantial body of writings regarding marriage preserved in Stobaeus' *Anthology*. Paradoxical though it might appear, such writings are replete with the *loci communes* of misogyny and misogamy. The reasons are twofold. First, the question 'should one marry or not?' was a stock thesis in rhetoric,<sup>183</sup> and some philosophical schools or philosophers answered in the negative, in the process utilising misogynistic topoi to spell out the disadvantages and annoyances attendant upon having a wife. Second, in writings on marriage negative advice decidedly predominates over the positive: that is to say, wives or brides-to-be, the primary addressees of such texts, are cautioned on what forms of behaviour to avoid, such behaviours invariably taking the form of the various defects characteristically imputed to the female sex in the dialectic of misogyny, and liable to irritate a husband.

We have argued in detail elsewhere<sup>184</sup> that treatises such as these were an important source of ideas for J.'s rhetoric of misogyny, J. even appearing at times to echo verbally misogynistic observations made in the treatises. Since, in addition, much of the pertinent material has been cited in the commentary, or in the introductory sections on the persona and *antimatrona*, it will suffice here to list briefly the points in question along with the corresponding passages of *Satire* 6, in the hope that their sheer volume will help to make the case that J. drew extensively on these compositions. They are as follows: 136–41, 142–60 and 161–83, which take as their premise the advice repeatedly tendered in protreptics on marriage not to choose a bride for her wealth, beauty or nobility; the pernicious effects of a mother-in-law on her daughter's behaviour (231–41); the emotional and bibulous excesses caused by orgiastic rites (314–45); the advisability or otherwise of educating women (434–56; for 448–50 in particular see on the persona); the evils and excesses of the female toilet (457–73); cautions against using fancy make-up, jewellery and elaborate hairstyles as betraying adulterous intentions (457–506; see particularly 504n.); the deplorable results of the alienation of wife from husband (508–11 especially); the invocation of tragic parallels to illuminate women's monstrous behaviour (634–61); the theme of wifely domination, which, particularly prominent though it is in New Comedy, takes on in J. a colour which seems especially indebted to the protreptics.<sup>185</sup>

<sup>182</sup> Treggiari, *RM* 183–5, 193, 204. <sup>183</sup> Braund 1992a: 78–9.

<sup>184</sup> Watson 2008a. <sup>185</sup> Cf. Watson 2008a: 281–3.



In drawing attention to writings on marriage as an inspiration for J. we merely wish to affirm the importance of a body of literature which has not always received the attention it deserves.<sup>186</sup> It is not our intention to claim that similar ideas cannot be found elsewhere, or to deny that *Satire* 6 is fed by multiple sources and draws on misogynistic themes that are both pervasive and traditional. Indeed, it is one of the merits of Grazia Battisti's 1996 monograph that she shows how the rhetoric of misogyny has penetrated numerous texts which by no stretch of the imagination set themselves up as invective, satire or as in any way misogynistic. Even passages such as Liv. 1.57.9, Tac. *Germ.* 18–19 and *Ann.* 3.34, which set out to defend or praise women, cannot help being informed by negative stereotypes of the female sex. Likewise, while Cato's speech opposing the repeal of the *lex Oppia* (Liv. 34.2–4) predictably exploits formulations standardly used to damn women (*impotentia muliebris, blanditiae, impotens natura et indomitum animale, licentia [mulierum]*), the response of the tribune who advocates the repeal of the law and professes sympathy for the women's position (ibid. 5–7) equally deals in reductive stereotypes (*libido muliebris, quid muliercularum censeatis, quas etiam parua mouent, haec infirmitas [sexus]*).

The majority of the stereotypes examined above appear immutable and timeless, demeaning psychological archetypes of the female psyche, as it were, forming part of the common literary currency of Greece and Rome. But it is important to realise that there is a degree of cultural specificity to Roman writings, J.'s included, which deal in misogyny. A peculiarly Roman concern about the deleterious effects of foreign *luxuria* comes through strongly in hostile discourse about women, surfacing for instance in Cato's speech against the abrogation of the *lex Oppia* (Liv. 34.4) and reappearing in Juv. 6.286–300. The same passage is informed by the rhetorical theme of the *locus de saeculo*, which protested about the abandonment of traditional moral standards.<sup>187</sup> It is pertinently exemplified in a declamation of Porcius Latro against a *matrona* accused of adultery, preserved in Sen. *Contr.* 2.7. Latro's opening gambit, *quamquam eo prolapsi iam mores civitatis sunt ut nemo ad suspicanda adulteria nimium credulus possit uideri*, keys into characteristically Roman anxieties about the relaxation of traditional matronal morality, and connects with J.'s *nullum crimen abest facinusque libidinis ex quo | paupertas Romana perit* (294–5),<sup>188</sup> as well as the overall contention of the *Satire* that adultery is nowadays pervasive. Equally Roman are Latro's ironic exhortations to contemporary wives of his day *prodite mihi*

<sup>186</sup> For example, De Decker 1913: 20–3 and Courtney 1980: 252 are dismissive of the notion that such writings influenced J.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. De Decker 1913: 22–38.

<sup>188</sup> Cf. also *iamque eadem summis pariter minimisque [feminis] libido* 349.

*fronte in omne lenocinium composita, paulo obscurius quam posita ueste nudaе, exquisito in omnes facetias sermone, tantum non ultro blandientes ut quisquis uiderit non metuat accedere: deinde miramini si, cum tot argumentis impudicitiam praescripseritis, cultu, incessu, sermone, facie, aliquis repertus est qui incurrenti adulterae se non subduceret* (§4). Both the concern that *matronae* blur the distinction between themselves and prostitutes by wearing diaphanous garb appropriate only to the latter (cf. Juv. 259–60) and the protest that wives have become so forward in dress, demeanour and conversation as to invite the attention of unrelated males, abandoning traditional matronal *uerecundia*, are classics of Roman polemic against uppity females, a type against which J.'s speaker protests at every turn.<sup>189</sup>

Other complaints too are self-evidently keyed to a specifically Roman context: women's obsession with gladiators and stage-performers, their use of Greek as the language of love, their pleading of court cases, undertaking of athletic and gladiatorial training, and sexual relations with eunuchs. But not only are these ultimately grounded in the portmanteau charge of *impotentia muliebris*, females' inherent lack of self-control, virtually every one of them is inherited by J. from his immediate satiric predecessor Martial (see esp. 76–7n., 184–99n., 230n., 413–33n., 638–9n.).

In sum, J.'s rhetoric of misogyny is, in its thematic and ideological conception, altogether literary and tralatitious. What gives it its originality is the series of brilliant vignettes,<sup>190</sup> focalised either through a representative individual or a class of individuals, that bring his complaints to vivid life.

## 5 THE PERSONA

Over the years, the sixth Satire has produced a wide diversity of readings. But almost every interpretation is tied to a central issue: how seriously is J.'s poem to be taken?<sup>191</sup>

It is now half a century since Mason proclaimed J. a classic of wit, rather than satire.<sup>192</sup> There have, however, been many before and since who have viewed *Satire* 6 as written with serious intent. Highet, one of the last to

<sup>189</sup> For the first cf. 259n. 'Phintys the Pythagorean', *On womanly modesty* Stob. 4.592 is unusual among Greek writings on marriage in cautioning against the wearing of diaphanous clothing or garments made from silk. For female immodesty and forwardness, cf. Sallust's Sempronia (*Cat.* 25).

<sup>190</sup> Cf. Scott 1927: 20–4, Kenney 2012: 130.

<sup>191</sup> Rudd 1986: 32–3 neatly sums up the dilemma: 'the poem as a whole cannot be taken seriously – there is too much comedy (a great deal of it enjoyable); equally, it cannot be regarded as an elaborate joke – there is too much that is serious'.

<sup>192</sup> Mason 1963.

embrace the now outmoded view of J. as a moralist,<sup>193</sup> held that he was writing out of a deeply cherished sense of affront at the corruption of Roman society as manifested in its upper-class women, and even postulated that his hostility to these stemmed from a failed marriage to one such.<sup>194</sup> Along the same lines, Bond<sup>195</sup> saw J. as protesting vainly against what was already a *fait accompli*, the abandonment of traditional wifely rôles by contemporary *matronae*, the prime agents, in J.'s opinion, of Rome's moral decline. According to Courtney, 'J. is spurred by genuine personal misogyny';<sup>196</sup> for Johnson, the poem is about a crisis of male identity and sexual angst in the face of female self-assertion and overturning of the old certainties in the performance of gender rôles.<sup>197</sup> And although adopting a more nuanced, psychoanalytical perspective, Richlin likewise regards *Satire* 6 as driven by personal conviction when she contends that it represents the sum of a patriarchally minded male's fears about inadequacy and a terror of gynaeocracy in the shape of dominating females.<sup>198</sup> So too Gold, who, albeit doing justice to the various elements of humour in the poem, concludes that *Satire* 6 is a mouthpiece for unremittingly misogynistic attitudes in which the implied reader is expected to collude.<sup>199</sup>

On the other side of the fence are ranged those who view *Satire* 6 as essentially a vehicle for humour. Such an approach is keyed to the so-called persona theory first applied to Roman satire by Anderson, who defined the satirist as 'not the writer of satire, but the voice speaking in the satires'.<sup>200</sup> Building on this premise and the attendant idea that the satiric speaker is a fallible and untrustworthy creation of the poet characterised by inconsistencies and illogicalities,<sup>201</sup> Anderson analysed the first-person speaker of *Satires* 1–6 as a dramatic construct, a poetic voice projected into the text which exhibited all the features of the individual burning with *indignatio*

<sup>193</sup> Some exponents are listed by Martyn 1979: 219 n. 1 and Gold 1994: 103 n. 23. For comparable nineteenth-century views see Nisbet 2012: 498 and 506. See also n. 205 below.

<sup>194</sup> Highet 1954: 91–103. This essentially autobiographical approach has been revived by Tennant 2002, for whom the *Satire* is fuelled by genuine animus and bitter personal experience of a decadent aristocracy.

<sup>195</sup> Bond 1979: 447. <sup>196</sup> Courtney 1980: 253; cf. 259.

<sup>197</sup> Johnson 1996. Note particularly the remark (174) that we should not doubt 'the sincerity of the injured psyche' on the Speaker's part. Somewhat similar is Rudd 1986: 203–4.

<sup>198</sup> Richlin 1992: 202–7.

<sup>199</sup> Gold 1994. For a critique of her arguments see Plaza 2006: 127–40.

<sup>200</sup> Anderson 1964 = Anderson 1982: 293–361.

<sup>201</sup> See particularly the summary of Kernan in Anderson 1964: 127 = Anderson 1982: 293.

or *ira* as Seneca defined him,<sup>202</sup> with all of that person's concomitant irrationalities, intolerance and obsessiveness.

The relevance of the Andersonian approach to the question posed above – is the Satire serious or not? – is that its proponents almost invariably see the stance adopted by the Speaker as self-defeating, and the Satire as a medium for humour rather than authentic social criticism. The focus, that is to say, is not so much on *what* the Speaker says as on the absurdly overblown and monomaniacal way in which he says it, with the upshot that he becomes, inadvertently, a figure of fun. Anderson's persona theory has had conspicuous success, particularly among Anglophone scholars.<sup>203</sup> His followers include Martyn, Winkler, Freudenburg, Plaza and, especially, Susanna Morton Braund,<sup>204</sup> whose reading of *Satire* 6 is emblematic of the general approach. Dismissing the realism of *Satire* 6 as a false problem whose time has passed,<sup>205</sup> she argues that J. creates a fictional character who is an obsessive misogynist with 'a dense concentration of the characteristics of rage which ... emphasise the dominance of passion over reason', with the upshot that he fails to make his case and, by his attitudinal and argumentative excesses, ends by becoming the victim of his own satire, an unwitting self-parody.<sup>206</sup> Similar are Freudenburg 2001<sup>207</sup> and Plaza, who argues that the series of vignettes pillorying female excesses by virtue of their density and risibility drown out the patriarchally minded Speaker's howls of protest, revealing that the primary mission of the poem is comedy.<sup>208</sup> Along the same lines is Winkler 1983,<sup>209</sup> with the difference that, for all the *bêtises* of the persona, the attacks are still seen per se to have redeeming educative value.<sup>210</sup> The most recent account of the satiric voice

<sup>202</sup> For a good analysis of *indignatio* as the keynote of *Satires* 1–6, see Braund 1988 ch. 1.

<sup>203</sup> Conversely, voices of protest by the leading Italian scholars Bellandi and Citroni are noted by Mayer 2003: 71 n. 28.

<sup>204</sup> Martyn 1979, Winkler 1983, Freudenburg 2001, Plaza 2006, Braund 1988, 1992b, 1996 and 1992a, discussed immediately below in the text.

<sup>205</sup> Grazia Battisti 1996: 15 n. 15 lists earlier scholars who think that *Satire* 6 reflects reality or similarly hold that the poem pictures the deplorable results of a moral revolution in the first century AD.

<sup>206</sup> Braund 1992a: 82–6 (quotation from p. 84).

<sup>207</sup> Freudenburg 2001: 254 'what we are looking at ... is the ... madman satirist. He is the show ... and there in that complete loss of control, he again becomes his satire's chief target.' The satirist figure as victim of his own satire is likewise a key theme of Keane 2006.

<sup>208</sup> Plaza 2006: 127–55.

<sup>209</sup> [J.] exposes the imperfections of his satiric objects. [But] he does so by means of a persona which in turn is ridiculed for its own shortcomings' (Winkler 1983: 223).

<sup>210</sup> Winkler 1983: 227–9.

in *Satire* 6, Nadeau,<sup>211</sup> equally operates within the parameters of persona theory. He postulates that *Satire* 6 is a dialogue between two competing voices, that of the straight man, and a humorist, who constantly undercuts the moralising and angry sermonising of the first figure, making the whole into a bravura display of wit and intertextual allusiveness.<sup>212</sup>

One of the most rewarding approaches to *Satire* 6 in recent years, Grazia Battisti's *la retorica della misoginia*, also works within the broad template of persona theory. She argues that the first-person speaker assembles a confection of long-established misogynistic themes and intertextual allusions whose threadbare character unmasks the intense literariness of the poem, disclosing its purpose to be, not a genuine attack on women, but 'put[ting] on stage misogyny as a discourse', demonstrating how to write a satire against womankind.<sup>213</sup>

There has however been a reaction of late against the fashionable orthodoxy of the persona theory.<sup>214</sup> Four objections in particular are marshalled: (1) the inconsistent attitudes which proponents of the theory seize upon as evidence of a flawed satiric mouthpiece may in fact stem from the author, (2) ancient texts were read autobiographically, which creates a presumption that Greek and Roman writers-as-readers penned their work in the same vein; of importance here is the early satirist Lucilius' confessional mode of composition, as described by Horace, *Sat.* 2.1.30–3, hence, (3), if a persona was adopted, as in Horace's second *Epode*, it was intended to reflect the author's own views, (4) discussions of the persona in Antiquity throw up nothing remotely similar to persona theory as now understood.

These are weighty points, but a defence can be mounted. To take (4) first, the absence from the literature of Antiquity of any mention of a persona theory comparable to ours hardly rules out the possibility that such a theory may implicitly have existed: many of the 'genres' discovered by Cairns in his groundbreaking *Generic composition in Greek and Roman poetry* lack a theoretical formulation or even a name going back to Antiquity, but, as he showed, they certainly had a de facto existence. Next, it is not

<sup>211</sup> Nadeau 2011: 11–16 *et passim*.

<sup>212</sup> See Nadeau 2011: 12–14 for his denial of seriousness to J.

<sup>213</sup> Grazia Battisti 1996. For a theoretical exposition of her reading see especially 10–12, 41, 51–2, 54–5, also 7 (introduction by Lowell Edmunds). The literariness of the *Satire* is advertised particularly by its being bookended by explicit allusions to a wide variety of literary genres – epic, didactic, elegy, declamatory rhetoric, tragedy.

<sup>214</sup> Clay 1998, Iddeng 2000, Mayer 2003. Mention should also be made of Hightet 1974, which, rejecting persona theory in its entirety, insisted that first-person satires are the autobiographically coloured utterance of the poet himself; cf. Tennant 2002. See also Plaza 2006: 22 n. 56 for critiques of persona theory stemming from New Historicism.

entirely accurate to claim that there was no ancient correlate to the persona as we now understand it: rôle-playing, the assumption of a mask,<sup>215</sup> was part of the rhetorical education of the Roman elite,<sup>216</sup> and it required no great leap of the imagination to transfer the technique to satire, deeply infused as it is with declamatory rhetoric.<sup>217</sup> Further, when Catullus, Ovid, Martial and Apuleius in well-known passages insist on a separation of their writings from the actuality of their lives,<sup>218</sup> it is special pleading to claim, as Mayer does,<sup>219</sup> that these remarks are the product of particular historical circumstances and cannot have a more global applicability to the distinction between autobiography and the utterances of a fictive personage voicing the text. Finally, although Clay, in an exhaustive enquiry, fails to discover any real ancient equivalent to our concept of the literary persona,<sup>220</sup> at least one of the examples which he throws up, literary epigrams where the poet identifies with and ventriloquises the thoughts of a fictional personage buried under a fictive monument,<sup>221</sup> seems to adumbrate the persona as now understood. Perhaps then the fault lies not with the theory, but some of the wilder excesses to which it has been subjected.<sup>222</sup>

<sup>215</sup> Seen in its most formal guise in the rhetorical device of the *prosopopoeia*, the introduction of a 'speech in character' by a personage, whose thoughts and attitudes the orator voices, as Cicero famously does with Appius Claudius Caecus in *Pro Caelio* 33–4. See conveniently Austin *ad loc.*

<sup>216</sup> Braund 1996: 3. <sup>217</sup> See De Decker 1913 *passim*.

<sup>218</sup> Catull. 16, Ov. *Tr.* 2.353–8, 3.2.5–6, Mart. 1.4, 11.15, Apul. *Apol.* 11.

<sup>219</sup> Mayer 2003: 66–71.

<sup>220</sup> Clay 1998. Despite the results of his investigation, Clay 18 nonetheless takes 'our modern theory of the literary persona ... as read'.

<sup>221</sup> Clay 1998: 18.

<sup>222</sup> E.g. the most extreme formulation of the persona theory whereby the persona becomes the *object* of the satire in order to sanitise the author, lest he seem to be articulating opinions offensive to modern sensibilities, illegitimately elides the possible convergences between the prejudices articulated by the persona and the attitudes entertained by the author – who after all is anchored in the society which he critiques; cf. Green 1998: xxvii–xxviii and Plaza 2006: 254–6. Some critics also point to inadequacies in the persona theory. For Keane 2006: 9, 13, 33 and 136–41, persona theory as conventionally applied to the satiric genre represents too circumscribed a critical tool, since it occludes the satirist-figure's engagement with 'various Roman male social agents' (137) and with the society of which he is a product. In a later article she rejects the 'negative' use of the persona theory, which concentrates attention on the separation between the poet himself and the stance adopted in his poetry, in favour of a 'positive' model, according to which the poet uses a series of *personae* throughout his oeuvre to fashion a satiric career (Keane 2010: esp. 111 n. 23). See also Wray 2001: 161–7 and Rosen 2007: 220–2, who observes that persona theory ducks the issue of why the poet decided to put on the particular mask that he assumed: and that even if we privilege the comedic aspects of satire, the question remains of 'why the jokes were configured as they were: why, in fact, are some people and things singled out for mockery and blame and others not?'

At this point we must declare our sympathy with the persona theory and spell out our particular approach to it. First, it must be stressed that J.'s use of the persona in *Satire* 6 is somewhat different from that employed by him elsewhere or in particular by Horace in his *Satires*, in which the poet fashions a fleshed-out, consistent character who implicitly becomes the object of satire/readerly interest in his manoeuvres. The misogynist of *Satire* 6, by contrast, is rhetoricising and biographically anonymous, a one-dimensional caricature rather than a character, or to put it another way, a 'disembodied talking head'.<sup>223</sup>

Our second and main point is that the criticisms levelled by the satiric voice of *Satire* 6 are, for the most part, counterfactual<sup>224</sup> or anachronistic, sometimes both together: moreover, that even when there is a kernel of truth in his complaints about female behaviour, the Speaker represents as normative what is in actuality quite exceptional. In other words, the persona's rabid polemic is not intended by J. to stand up to scrutiny when measured against the cold realities of historical fact. The consequence is that the Speaker is stripped of satiric authority: his mordant, hysterical stridency comes off as rhetorically coloured bluster that seeks to bludgeon into submission countervailing voices of rationality and objectivity, but is, by authorial design, doomed to fail, and in the process to elicit amusement at the brilliance of the vignettes conjured up, but not intellectual assent.

The thesis of *Satire* 6 is that the women of J.'s day are so irredeemably corrupt that to wed is an act of folly and marriage unalloyed misery.<sup>225</sup> The Speaker supports this reasoning by imputing to the *matronae* of Rome a range of vices and idiosyncrasies which make life with them insupportable, such as their obsession with sex, love of luxury, irascibility and so on: commonplaces well established in the annals of misogynistic writing.<sup>226</sup> But this picture is exposed as wilfully reductive and one-sided by a wealth of literary and epitaphic sources which attest supposedly exemplary wives and blissful marriages. Not only do epitaphs for *matronae* sometimes praise them for the very qualities which the satirist finds so objectionable, raising the possibility of a much less dyspeptic viewpoint,<sup>227</sup> but sepulchral

<sup>223</sup> Thanks to James Uden for this formulation and for raising the point made in this paragraph.

<sup>224</sup> 'A remarkable feature of J.'s satire ... is its faithlessness to fact' (Hooley 2007: 137).

<sup>225</sup> For the sentiment cf. Antiphanes, fr. 285 K-A 'for marriage is the utmost in misfortune' and Aristophanes, fr. 6 K-A. J.'s position is far more extreme than the paternalistic one which viewed wives as a necessary evil: see intro. 26.

<sup>226</sup> Various instances are collected in the footnotes to Watson 2008a: 274–5. See also intro. § 4.

<sup>227</sup> E.g. *CIL* vi 9693 *facilis, formosa puella, docta* (contrast Juv. 6.434–56), *opulenta* (contrast Juv. 6.135–41), *pia, casta, pudica, proba* and *CLE* 52.7 *sermone lepido* or 1307.4 *nec sine laetitia sermo*; again contrast J. 434–56, which is underpinned by the traditional view that silence is an adornment in a woman (438–43n.).

inscriptions for *matronae* standardly ascribe to them precisely those virtues which J. flatly denies his monstrous wives. We read for example of 'Turia's' *domestica bona pudicitiae, opsequi, comitatis, facilitatis, lanificiis tuis . . . religionis sine superstitione, ornatus non conspiciendi, cultus modici . . . cetera innumerabilia [quae] habueris communia cum omnibus matronis dignam famam colentibus*, *ILS 8393* col. 1.30–3. Similar things are said of Murdia (*ILS 8394*),<sup>228</sup> as of Postumia Matronilla, *incomparabilis coniux, mater bona, auia piissima, pudica, religiosa, laboriosa, frugi, efficax, uigilans, sollicita uniuira, unicuba, totius industriae et fidei matrona* (*ILS 8444*). And these examples are simply a few among many. Numerous other epitaphs for wives claim for them those maternal virtues of hard work, chastity, piety and the like which, according to J.'s speaker, have long vanished into the mists of time: an unsettling discrepancy which must call into question the satiric speaker's refusal to discover anything but a deep-rooted viciousness and the systematic dismantling of traditional maternal proprieties in contemporary women.

*Elogia* for wives or married couples often celebrate the *concordia* and mutual devotion in which they lived: examples include *ILS 1259 iugi fideli simplici concordia | iuuans maritum, diligens ornans colens* or Tacitus' celebration of Agricola's marriage, *uixeruntque mira concordia, per mutuam caritatem et in uicem se anteposendo* (*Agr. 6.1*).<sup>229</sup> Such accounts by their very typicality call into question the Speaker's picture, relentlessly pressed home throughout the poem, of matrimony as a battleground invariably characterised by mutual disharmony and self-interest. Again, how can one square comments such as *o lux clara uiro, mens una et cura, marito* (*CLE 1431.5*) or the many laudations in funerary inscriptions of a wife's frugality and domestic management skills<sup>230</sup> with the likes of J.'s *nulla uiri cura interea nec mentio fiet | damnorum. uiuit tamquam uicina mariti, | hoc solo propior, quod amicos coniugis odit | et seruos, grauis est rationibus* (508–11)? A text such as *ILS 8145 tres uxores h[abui; eas] quiden dolui, set non sunt. qua[m] uelim] modo quartaria sorte ductam su[perstitem habeam]* celebrating marriage in extravagantly positive terms surely represents an equally valid take on the institution which must, at the least, serve to balance the critical ledger.

There is, of course, no denying that celebrations of model wives such as the above are every bit as conventional as the rhetoric of misogyny upon which J. draws so extensively for *Satire 6*. The truth must lie somewhere in between: Roman wives were in the main neither paragons of every conceivable virtue nor the monsters of depravity that the Speaker depicts.

<sup>228</sup> *modestia probitate pudicitia opsequio lanificio diligentia fide par similisque ceteris probeis feminis fuit.*

<sup>229</sup> Cf. also Plin. *Ep.* 3.16.10 (Arria and Paetus). <sup>230</sup> See intro. 22.



An overarching theme of the Satire is the hypersexuality of contemporary *matronae*, the claim that they are without exception slaves to their *libido* (e.g. 53, 130, 254, 329–34, 349, 535–7). Most frequently this is manifested in their rejection of *pudicitia*, leading them to engage in adulterous sexual activities of every conceivable kind. While the Speaker's outrage against adultery is not in itself outmoded, given imperial reaffirmations of the Augustan marriage laws and promotion of the ideal of *pudicitia*, it is noteworthy, however, that female sexual desire is represented as excessive even within marriage. In a prominent position near the beginning of the Satire (35–7), one of the reasons why *pueri delicati* are allegedly preferable to a wife is the latter's unreasonable sexual demands (*pusio, qui noctu non litigat... | ... nec queritur quod | et lateri parcas nec quantum iussit anheles*). Later, a *matrona*'s frustration when her husband sleeps with his back to her (475–6) is made responsible for an orgy of violence on her part against her hapless slaves. This negative portrayal of wifely sexuality is a reflection, exaggerated for satiric purposes, of traditional Roman thinking, which required that for a married woman sex should be procreational not recreational, thoughts of enjoyment being deemed immodest.<sup>231</sup>

There is, however, considerable evidence that by J.'s time mutual sexual passion was accepted, in practice if not in theory, as an important aspect of marriage: the evidence includes Martial on Sulpicia (10.35, 38), who apparently described her marriage in distinctly sexual terms, and Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.55–6 *ex te* (Priscilla, wife of Abascantus) *maior honos, unum nouisse cubile, | unum secretis agitare sub ossibus ignem*.<sup>232</sup> In this respect, then, the *persona* betrays an attitude which is out of touch with the society of J.'s day.

The most productive method of weighing the reliability of the Speaker is to test his attitudes and complaints against historically verifiable facts. In 60–77 he accuses the women of Rome of being erotically obsessed with stage performers, to the extent of producing bastards by musicians of one type or another (cf. Tac. *Dial.* 29.3 *propria et peculiaria huius Urbis vitia paene in utero matris conc<epta> ... histrionalis fauor et gladiatorum equorumque studia*; conversely he praises German women (*Germ.* 19) for being, unlike their Roman counterparts, *nullis spectaculorum illecebris ... corruptae*). It is true that pantomime, with which J. leads off this section, was exceedingly titillating,<sup>233</sup> capable of stirring audiences to extremes of emotion.<sup>234</sup> Certainly too there were reported instances of relationships between actors and *matronae*, e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 45.4 (an actor in *togatae* and a matron), Tac. *Ann.* 11.4.1 (Poppaea Sabina and the pantomime Mnester); cf. Tac. *Ann.* 11.36.1–2, Dio Cass. 60.22.3–5, 28.3. But such accusations should

<sup>231</sup> Cf. Jocelyn 1983. <sup>232</sup> Cf. Treggiari, *RM* 253–61, Watson 2005: 81–6.

<sup>233</sup> See 63–4n. <sup>234</sup> Cf. Lucian, *Salt.* 83, Beacham 1999: 144–5.

be treated with circumspection,<sup>235</sup> and, even if true, stood out as exceptional precisely because of their sensational violation of legal and class boundaries.<sup>236</sup> When Circe's maid, drawing on the identical stereotype of sexually déclassée *matronae*, remarks that *some* women are attracted by performers (Petron. *Sat.* 126.6), she shows a greater sense of realism than the Speaker here, for whom *every woman without exception* is enamoured of actors – as is clearly intimated by the initial rhetorical question (61–2) *cuneis an habent spectacula totis | quod securus ames quodque inde excerpere possis?*, following on as it does from a section in which the Speaker had claimed that there is no such thing as a chaste woman nowadays. Not only does this universalising account of Rome's women as stage-struck groupies offend common sense, the particularly lurid colours in which it is painted provoke the suspicion of an overblown rhetoricism designed by its sheer hyperbole to occasion incredulous laughter.

In 136–41 Caesennia exploits her large dowry to make her husband turn a blind eye to her extramarital *amours*. Developing a hint in Horace,<sup>237</sup> J. gives a specifically sexual colour to the stock accusation, beloved in particular of New Comedy,<sup>238</sup> that rich wives use their wealth to effect the submission of their husbands; some instances are Plaut. *Men.* 766–7 *ita istaec solent, quae uiros subseruire | sibi postulant, dote fretae, feroces*, Sen. *Contr.* 1.6.5 *omnes uxores diuites seruitutem exigunt: crede mihi, uolet in suis regnare diuitiis* and Mart. 8.6.1–3 *uxorem quare locupletem ducere nolim, | quaeritis? uxori nubere nolo meae. | inferior matrona suo sit, Prisce, marito*. Now there may be some truth to the charge (so a passage of the *Pro Scauro* suggests),<sup>239</sup> and it was certainly the case that, while a husband had the use of his wife's dowry during their marriage, he had no legal claim to it in the event of divorce (137n.), giving her a financial hold over him. This said, there is copious evidence that a large dowry was widely regarded as a desideratum. For example, Horace mentions an *uxorem cum dote* as one of the illusory 'benefits', ardently wished for by many, that *regina Pecunia* can provide (*Ep.* 1.6.36–7); Seneca, in *De matrimonio*, notes *multos non oculis, sed digitis, uxores ducere*.<sup>240</sup> Apul. *Apol.* 92, for all its tendentiousness, makes it clear that a large dowry was a real inducement to a potential husband, while Terentia's accusation that Cicero was marrying his second wife, the

<sup>235</sup> Cf. Leppin 1992: 116–19, who lists all the relevant instances.

<sup>236</sup> Nor were women the only guilty parties: men too fell in love with male performers. A famous instance was Maecenas' passion for the pantomime Bathyllus (Tac. *Ann.* 1.54). Sen. *Ep.* 47.17 sneers that certain *nobilissimi iuuenes* are the *manicipia pantomimorum*. Further cases of same-sex relationships are listed by Leppin 1992: 116–19.

<sup>237</sup> See 136–41n. <sup>238</sup> Schuhmann 1977; intro. § 4.

<sup>239</sup> Cic. *Pro Scaur.* 8 *is cum hanc suam uxorem, anum et locupletem et molestam, timeret, neque eam habere in matrimonio propter foeditatem neque dimittere propter dotem uolebat*.

<sup>240</sup> Ap. Jer. *Adu. Iovinian.* 312c.

very rich Publilia, for her youthful charms (ἔρωτι τῆς ὥρας) was effectively defused by the counter-claim that Cicero's motive was to get clear of his debts – evidently a perfectly respectable motive.<sup>241</sup> In fact 'to an upper class man at first marriage his wife's property could be expected to bring essential capital at an important moment in his career ... this consideration is likely to have outweighed the topos ... that a well-dowered wife was likely to bully her husband because she had too great a hold over him'.<sup>242</sup> But in the world of the satirist, the notion that a *dotata uxor* will cow her spouse into submission is simply a given, and the advantages which a large dowry might bring are passed over in silence. Instead we are presented in 136–41 with a lurid, one-sided vignette in which the perfectly natural desire for a well-dowered spouse is reconfigured as greed and the husband reduced by his *dotata uxor* to a state of utter abjection, in the manner of an elegiac *amator*: a triumph of rhetoric over reality.

In 242–3 the Speaker asserts *nulla fere causa est in qua non femina litem | mouerit*. So overstated is this claim that it is surely designed to provoke incredulous disbelief. Valerius Maximus (8.3), in listing women *quas condicio naturae et uerecundia stolae ut in foro et iudiciis tacerent cohibere non ualuit*, can, significantly, muster only three examples. And every one of these represents a special case. The last of them, Hortensia, daughter of the great Hortensius, was inspired to plead by family tradition (Val. Max. § 3). Further, both Hortensia and the first of Valerius' female litigants, Maesia of Sentinum, were acting under pressure of historical circumstances which robbed them of representation in court by a male relative, the normal procedure for females facing litigation.<sup>243</sup> And the same may have been true of the variously named Afrania or Carfania,<sup>244</sup> whom Valerius, playing to the same male prejudices as J.'s speaker, savagely vilifies for immodesty and litigiousness (§2). That is to say, two, or possibly all three, of Valerius' examples found themselves in the same situation as 'Turia', who was similarly compelled by exceptional circumstances<sup>245</sup> to press unaided for the investigation of her parents' murder and to uphold her rights under her father's will, since both her natural male protectors were absent from Italy.<sup>246</sup> In short, what J.'s speaker represents in 242–3 as routine behaviour is in truth highly exceptional.<sup>247</sup> Such gross distortion of reality is hardly designed to command assent. The rhetorical question posed by

<sup>241</sup> Plut. *Cic.* 41.3–4.      <sup>242</sup> Treggiari, *RM* 96.

<sup>243</sup> Marshall 1989 and 1990.      <sup>244</sup> Marshall 1989: 43–7.

<sup>245</sup> Civil war in 49 BC.      <sup>246</sup> *ILS* 8393 col. 1.1–25.

<sup>247</sup> Cf. Marshall 1989: 47 'Indeed, Valerius Maximus' very listing of the stories of Afrania, Maesia and Hortensia under the cautionary rubric *quae mulieres apud magistratus pro se aut pro aliis causas egerunt* shows that they were curiosities who ran counter to established custom.'

Laronia (*Sat.* 2.51) *numquid nos [feminae] agimus causas?* is in factual terms much closer to the mark.

In lines 224–30, generalising as usual from the particular, J.'s speaker accuses wives of engaging in whirlwind marriages and divorces, a theme to which he returns at O17. Kajanto, Shaw and Treggiari have, however, all questioned that frivolous and frequent divorce was anything like as common as the moralists claim.<sup>248</sup> Treggiari, moreover, notes that authentic instances of multiple divorce and remarriage often stem from the aggressive, thrusting politics of the late Republic, in which alliances between leading figures might be cemented by politically advantageous marriages, until a new alliance supervened:<sup>249</sup> something clearly less of a factor under the imperial system of J.'s day. It seems that the theme of serial marriages and divorces has more to do with literature than real life.<sup>250</sup>

We turn now to 352–65. While the primary thrust of these verses is an assault on women's spendthrift tendencies, personified in Ogulnia, a supplementary target is the object of her passion, Greek athletes and athletics (352, 356nn.). Traditionally minded Romans objected for a host of reasons to these,<sup>251</sup> not least because the contestants were naked,<sup>252</sup> and in front of women at that: cf. Plut. *Cato Mai.* 20.8, Suet. *Aug.* 44.3 (Augustus excluded females from viewing such contests).<sup>253</sup> Nepos observes in the preface to his *Lives* (§5) that, whereas athletes were venerated in Greece, the opposite was true in Rome. But, as usual with the subjects of J.'s attacks, this is far from the full story:<sup>254</sup> by his day, attitudes to athletics were altering. With the institution of the *Neronia* in AD 60 and the *Capitolia* in AD 86, Greek-style athletic contests attained increasing acceptance at Rome.<sup>255</sup> Tacitus' (disapproving) account of the establishment of the *Neronia* (*Ann.* 14.20–1) cannot disguise the fact that the Games found favour with many (*ludicrum Romae institutum est ad morem Graeci certaminis, uaria fama, ut cuncta ferme noua... pluribus ipsa licentia placebat*). Greek athletic training became a common leisure activity at Rome, and the mosaic pavements of

<sup>248</sup> Kajanto 1969, Shaw 2002: 234–41, Treggiari 1991: 42–4.

<sup>249</sup> Treggiari 1991: 43.

<sup>250</sup> In particular the detail of eight *mariti* in five autumns (229–30) is inspired by Martial's *Telesilla* (6.7), who tots up ten husbands in thirty days.

<sup>251</sup> Nakedness, uselessness, associated with undesirable *otium*, less effective than Roman military training, an unwelcome Greek importation (Mähl 1974: 40–54, with full documentation).

<sup>252</sup> Crowther 1980.

<sup>253</sup> Cf. also Plutarch's account of traditional Roman attitudes to Greek gymnasia (*Q. Rom.* 274d) and Trajan's sneer *gymnasiis indulgent Graeculi* (Plin. *Ep.* 10.40). In fact there had been Greek athletic contests at Rome since 186 BC (Newby 2005: 25–6).

<sup>254</sup> Newby 2005: 38–41.

<sup>255</sup> Significantly, the *Capitolia* were not abolished following the assassination and *damnatio memoriae* of Domitian.

Rome and Ostia, especially those depicting named and famous athletes, provide good evidence of the popularity of athletic contests.<sup>256</sup> To summarise: the Speaker's criticisms and sneers are exposed as one-sided and anachronistic when viewed through the lens of attitudinal changes over the years.

When lines 434–56 attack an over-educated harpy who loudly and pedantically forces her erudition upon all, J. is keying into an ongoing debate regarding the issue of female education. And as usual, the Speaker's position is old-fashioned and one-sided, echoing (notably at 448–50) the complaints reported by Musonius 3 that 'women who associate with philosophers are bound to be arrogant for the most part and presumptuous, in that, abandoning their own households and turning to the company of men, they practise speeches, talk like sophists and analyse syllogisms', or the attitude of Seneca's father, a man of *antiquus rigor... maiorum consuetudini deditus*, who did not allow his wife Helvia to pursue beyond a superficial level her study of the liberal arts *propter istas, quae litteris non ad sapientiam utuntur sed ad luxuriam instruuntur* (Sen. *Helv.* 17.3–4): thereby revealing a fine sense of masculine prejudice which is also on show in Martial's claim that one of the ingredients for a happy life is a *non doctissima coniunx* (2.90.9).

There were, however, many who took a quite different view of the matter, competing voices which J. entirely blocks out. The Younger Pliny praises his wife's *studium litterarum* (*Ep.* 4.19) and extols as *docta politaque* the *uxor* of Erucius (*Ep.* 1.16.6), assuming that his peers will approve of the wifely accomplishments which he celebrates. Musonius argues that daughters should be afforded the same education as sons and urges that women as well as men should study philosophy:<sup>257</sup> an enlightened position echoed in *Prae. coniug.* 145b–146a by Plutarch, who additionally composed a lost work entitled 'That a woman too should be educated'.<sup>258</sup> Even Martial (writing in a different vein from 2.90) includes erudition in a conventional list of wifely virtues (12.97.3), as does the epitaphic catalogue of Euphrosyne's qualities, *CIL* vi 9693.<sup>259</sup> But J.'s speaker allows only one side of the debate to emerge. In his world, a *docta matrona* is bound to exhibit 'that unpleasant meddlesomeness' which Plutarch, in a revealing remark, says an advanced education is liable to impart to young women (*Pomp.* 55) – even as he conceded, also revealingly, that the highly educated Cornelia, Pompey's fifth wife, of whom he is speaking, was in fact free from such.

<sup>256</sup> Newby 2005: 15, 58–62, also ch. 3.

<sup>257</sup> Musonius treatises 4 and 3. Admittedly his arguments for female education are based on the pragmatic grounds that this makes them better wives and mothers: see further Engel 2003.

<sup>258</sup> See also Diog. Laert. 1.91. <sup>259</sup> See n. 227 above.

At 457–9 *nil non permittit mulier sibi, turpe putat nil, | cum uirides gemmas collo circumdedit et cum | auribus extentis magnos commisit elenchos* J. draws a direct connection between the wearing of jewels and adultery. The argument is a familiar one in moralising and misogynistic discourse,<sup>260</sup> keying into male anxieties about female self-beautification; but the automatic nexus between jewellery and immorality forged by J. will not withstand scrutiny. Already the debate over the repeal of the *lex Oppia* showed that Roman women, especially upper-class ones, wore jewellery and other finery in social contexts which not even the rhetoric of a Cato could paint as sexual: in fact the wearing of expensive jewels was an important marker of rank for women of standing. A great deal of Roman jewellery survives, an indicator of its ubiquity.<sup>261</sup> Further confirmation comes from Ovid, who, addressing the *matronae* of his day, states *conspicuum gemmis uultis habere manum; | induitis collo lapides Oriente petitos | et quantos onus est aure tulisse duos* (MF 20–2). Seneca *Hekv.* 16.3 singles out his mother for not succumbing to the passion for *gemmae* and *margaritae* which afflicts ‘the majority’ of contemporary women. Married women regularly included jewels in their legacies, as shown by legal evidence (e.g. Ulp. *Dig.* 34.2, *Dig.* 34.2.32.8, pearl *elenchi* earrings and emeralds) and even a modest young bride had *uestes margarita gemmas* (Plin. *Ep.* 5.16.7).<sup>262</sup> And the wearing of jewellery by matrons was only a continuation of a practice begun in childhood: girls who died before marriage were buried with their jewels.<sup>263</sup> In sum, the claim that women don jewels only to commit adultery is both tralaticious and counterfactual, something that must have been palpable to any Roman reader.

Lastly a word on the aristocratic wives of 247–67 whom J. pictures training as gladiators, perhaps even for actual combat in the arena (250–1). In reality, instances of upper-class women appearing in gladiatorial contests are rare (Brunet 2004), nor was this necessarily a matter of choice, as the Speaker imagines (cf. 246–67n.). The women in question were nearly always slaves or prisoners of war. But, as with the litigious women of 242–5, J.’s speaker presents the exception as the rule and, although he sexualises his female combatants (253–4, 264), is too busy exploding with outrage to register the fact that female gladiators will have represented a real draw-card for spectators,<sup>264</sup> because these reflect a popular taste for the unusual

<sup>260</sup> Cf. 457–73n.      <sup>261</sup> Olson 2008: 54–5.

<sup>262</sup> Not to mention the *aurum margaritae* of the exemplary ‘Turia’ (*ILS* 8393 col. 2.2).

<sup>263</sup> Oliver 2000.

<sup>264</sup> McCullough 2008: 204–5 notes that sources which mention low-status female gladiators or do not specify status (i.e. are not concerned with the putative *infamia* of well-born women appearing in the arena) ‘are noncommittal or mildly enthusiastic’: cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.51–4 *hos inter fremitus nouosque luxus | spectandi leuis effugit uoluptas: | stat sexus rudis insciusque ferri | ut pugnas capit improbus uiriles!*

in the arena, and perhaps also because spectators had the opportunity to see individuals who would not normally be thought capable of bravery exhibit courage in such an archetypally masculine sport.<sup>265</sup>

The arguments presented above could easily be extended, e.g. by showing that the use of cosmetics (461–73) or code-switching (184–99)<sup>266</sup> were by no means necessarily as sinister or offensive as the Speaker asserts, that just as many men as women (cf. 627–61) engaged in poisoning, and that Messalina's nightly romps in the brothel, which the Speaker makes emblematic of female sexual insatiability in general, are more than likely ahistorical (114–32n.).

In the foregoing we have argued that much of what the Speaker says, by virtue of out-and-out counterfactuality, grotesque exaggerations, slanted presentation of the facts and embrace of conspicuously outmoded attitudes, is designed to fail in its ostensible object of persuading the reader, even as it arouses admiration for the brilliance and virtuosity of the individual portraits. What then, by way of conclusion, is the reader to make of J.'s speaker? His essence is perhaps best captured by a pair of observations encountered in literary texts. The first is *frequenter amaritudo ipsa ridicula est* (Quintil. *Inst. or.* 10.1.117), a trap into which the *persona loquens* decidedly and designedly falls.<sup>267</sup> The second is a remark in Euripides' *Protesilaus* (fr. 657 Kannicht), 'whoever, lumping them together finds fault with all women collectively is stupid and unwise'.<sup>268</sup>

## 6 JUVENAL'S STYLE

Useful brief accounts of J.'s style, which is profoundly coloured by rhetoric, may be readily consulted.<sup>269</sup> Rather than repeat their conclusions here, it may be more instructive, in the first instance, to show his style in action

<sup>265</sup> Cf. Brunet 2004. The two combatants in the inscribed relief of female gladiators from Halicarnassus (246–67n.) each have one breast exposed, suggesting they are modern-day Amazons (cf. Mevia in *Sat.* 1.22–3).

<sup>266</sup> Defined by Adams 2003: 19 as 'a full-blown switch from one language into another within one person's utterance or piece of writing' – in the passage under consideration, from Latin into Greek. As Adams shows (297–416) the switch from Latin into Greek could be harnessed in a variety of contexts and in a multitude of innocuous ways; but J. chooses to present his target's appropriation of Greek as a morally dubious abandonment of her native linguistic birthright, thereby mobilising Roman prejudices against Greeks and Greek ways (for code-switching thus polemically used see Uden 2011: 120–2). So once again J. puts the worst possible construction on what was inoffensive to many.

<sup>267</sup> Quintilian is noting here how the excessive acerbity of the orator Cassius Severus' wit proved counter-productive.

<sup>268</sup> For this idea, compare the examples assembled by Gibson on Ov. *Ar.* 3.9–10 *parcite paucarum diffundere crimen in omnes; | spectetur meritis quaeque puella suis*.

<sup>269</sup> Courtney 1980: 36–55, Braund 1996: 24–30, Kenney 2012. Detailed exposition of the particularly rhetorical aspects of J.'s style in De Decker 1913: 103–98; see also Braund 1996: 21.

by close analysis of a single segment of *Satire* 6: 314–34, where many of its most typical features are present.

The passage commences with the oxymoron *nota... secreta*, a favourite device of the satirist (cf. *zelotypae... moechae* 278, 118n.), before featuring a characteristically effective use of enjambment in the shape of the emphatic *attonitae, concubitus* and especially the paradoxical *Priapi | maenades*, which makes the point that the women are mad with lust, not, as *maenades* would normally imply, Dionysiac possession (316–17n.). A further instance of paradox, a figure constantly employed by J., comes in 329 *iam fas est, admitte uiros*: the point being that what was strictly *nefas*, the admission of men to the all-female rites of Bona Dea, here becomes *fas* in the participants' eroticised perversion of the *sacra*. Also typical of the satirist is the use of a Greek term, *maenades*, literally 'women in a maddened state'. Grecisms in J. are invariably employed with specific effect,<sup>270</sup> and the tone is generally sneering, as here, the implication being that Dionysian-style abandonment is out of place at one of the most hallowed rites in the Roman religious calendar. The *tricolon* in 317–19 combines rhetorical exclamation (*o quantus* etc.) with anaphora (*quantus... quantus*),<sup>271</sup> both typical of J. in indignant mode. It has been noted that he, unlike his fellow-satirists Lucilius and Horace, avoids primary obscenities such as *cunnus*, preferring to use metaphorical euphemisms: cases in point are *meri... torrens* 319, referring to vaginal secretions, and *fluctum* 322, of the fluid, rippling motions of Medullina's bottom as she shimmies (*crisantis*) suggestively. *torrens* is also an example of another favourite device of J., hyperbole, which sometimes operates, as here, at the level of the individual word, but mostly involves a wildly exaggerated sentiment, e.g. 486 *praefectura domus Sicula non mitior aula*, 628 *iam iam priuignum occidere fas est*.

Parody is a key weapon in J.'s satiric armoury, often in the form of epic locutions inserted into a sordid context. That is the case with *posita... corona* 320, which conjures up verbally an athletic contest such as we find in *Aeneid* 5,<sup>272</sup> rather than a competition in erotic dancing. Parody is still more obvious in 326, where the dignified patronymic *Laomedontiades* is twinned with a wicked spoof (*Nestoris hirnea*) on epic formulae such as ἵς Ὀδυσσεύς to send up opportunistically the sexual incapacity of old men. Brief choppy clauses and compression of syntax, encountered at 323–5 and 329–33, are a common recourse of the author. In the first case, in combination with prosaic vocabulary,<sup>273</sup> they serve as a pointedly contrastive lead-in to the ringing epicisms of 326. In the second, their rôle

<sup>270</sup> Bracciali Magnini 1982.

<sup>271</sup> The anaphora gains in force from the late punctuation preceding the second *quantus*.

<sup>272</sup> For *posita corona* evoking such an epic context see 320–1n.

<sup>273</sup> For J.'s use of non-literary words see e.g. Kenney 2012: 134.



is to mimic syntactically the sexual urgency which the women are feeling. J. is expert at employing words of lowly tone at odds with the elevated connotations of the hexameter, satire's established metrical vehicle. One such case is *prurigo* 327, referring to a sexual itch, which gains in effect by juxtaposition with the mock-grandiosity of 326.<sup>274</sup> In the same line comes the pithy *sententia*, *tum femina simplex*: *sententiae* are a pronounced feature of J.'s style, as of the literature of the Empire in general.<sup>275</sup> Lastly, 333–4 incorporate one of J.'s favourite devices, the deflationary or bathetic conclusion:<sup>276</sup> here in the shape of bestiality, the key term *asello* for the lover-quadruped being held over till last,<sup>277</sup> and the descent further pointed by *imposito*, the correct term for putting a male animal to the female, as well as *clunem*: more elevated than *nates* and hence ironic in the context, it is also commonly used of the hindquarters of an animal and thus by implication reduces the woman who is being mounted to the zoological level of her partner.

We have already discussed in the section on J.'s life and work two matters which overlap with the question of J.'s style – the issue of whether he writes in the so-called *genus grande*, 'high style', and the broad influence of rhetoric on J.'s compositional technique. Other characteristics of J.'s style not represented in the verses just discussed or dealt with elsewhere include the so-called 'Golden Line', an epic device featuring one verb and a pair of balancing nouns and adjectives, generally used by the satirist with mock-grandiose effect (e.g. 24, 160, 636);<sup>278</sup> the rhetorical question (e.g. 300, 342–5); the pointed antithesis (e.g. 81); terminal *sententiae*, such as 141 *uidua est, locuples quae nupsit auaro* (cf. 24, 456), a structural device to demarcate a section from the immediately following one; the clever use of diminutives, e.g. *testiculi* 339, where the mouse shows a greater religious scrupulosity in regard to its tiny male appendages than does the prodigiously endowed Clodius in drag.

Among the various ways of enlivening his style, one that stands out is J.'s employment of direct speech. This assumes two forms: (i) the use of an interlocutor, a standard satiric device:<sup>279</sup> see 55–7, 136, 142 and 161; (ii) *prosopopoeia* in its wider sense of a passage where persons are imagined as speaking,<sup>280</sup> either individually (e.g. 146–8, Amphion at 172–3, 416–17) or as part of a conversation, e.g. 219–23 (an argument between husband

<sup>274</sup> Other instances where elevated language is deliberately deflated by insertion of a prosaic term: *Sat.* 5.23, 14.22.

<sup>275</sup> De Decker 1913: 154–66, Bonner 1969: 54–5. <sup>276</sup> Cf. n. 88 above.

<sup>277</sup> A 'decending climax', in Richlin's elegant formulation.

<sup>278</sup> Kenney 2012: 135–6.

<sup>279</sup> As exemplified in Hor. *Sat.* 2 and Pers. 1.44 *quisquis es, o modo quem ex aduerso dicere feci*.

<sup>280</sup> See Lausberg § 826; above n. 215.

and wife), O27–9 and 637–42 (a hostile exchange between the poisoner Pontia and the satiric speaker).

Apostrophe is a familiar aspect of J.'s rhetorical style.<sup>281</sup> In *Satire* 6 a particularly effective use is made of the device in indignant mode in order to highlight especially egregious instances of female insufferability, e.g. 167–71 (Cornelia), 192–9 (a sexually active octogenarian), 494–5 (the lady who mistreats her hairdresser), 641–2 (Pontia).

A final dimension of J.'s style, peculiar to *Satire* 6, is a tendency to swing abruptly between the third person singular with reference to an individual woman – who may or may not be named – and a plural 'they' which encompasses women as a class. Good instances are 243–4 *accusat Manilia, si rea non est. | componunt ipsae per se formantque libellos*, and the Eppia episode; this begins with an account of Eppia's doings (82–94), after which J. switches in mid-line to general observations on women's attitude towards seafaring (*si ratio est et honesta, timent pauidoque gelantur | pectore* etc.), before breaking down the 'they' of 95–7 into two representative individuals in the shape of *illa* and *haec* (100–1).<sup>282</sup> The effect of this is to imply that all women share the same traits and proclivities, specific examples merely typifying the sex as a whole.

## 7 TEXTUAL TRADITION AND THE OXFORD FRAGMENT

Excellent general accounts of J.'s text are available and do not need repeating here,<sup>283</sup> other than to state the central fact that the manuscript tradition is divided into two classes, the first represented by the ninth-century P and its congeners, the latter by an inferior, interpolated strain designated Φ by Clausen. *Satire* 6 has its share of problematical lines, the majority of which are most probably to be deleted as interpolations (see nn. on 65, 126, 138, 188, 209–11, 460, 558–9, 561, 614A–C),<sup>284</sup> while the status of others is more controversial (cf. 133–5, 588nn.). On occasion, difficulties with meaning or train of thought have been explained by positing a

<sup>281</sup> De Decker 1913: 173–6, who lists most of the instances from *Satire* 6; also Urech 1999: 8–11.

<sup>282</sup> See also 474–5; 480–1 *est pretium curae . . . cognoscere toto | quid faciant agentque die, . . . sunt quae tortoribus annua praestent. | uerberat atque obiter faciem linit.*

<sup>283</sup> Courtney 1975: 147–8, Tarrant 1983, Nisbet 1995: 272–3, Parker 2012.

<sup>284</sup> It tells in favour of regarding a number of the suspected lines as interpolations that they are found only in the inferior MS tradition: see Willis's introduction to his edition vii–xviii. For a history of scholarly attitudes to interpolations in J., which have swung wildly between extremes, see Housman's introduction to his 1905 edition xxxi–vi, Nisbet 1995: 283–4, Parker and Braund 2012: 451–3, also Parker 2012: 149–50.

lacuna (38n., 461n., 585–6n.) or else by assuming that lines have been misplaced, a solution being found either in simply reversing the order of a pair of lines (nn. on 43–4, 307–8, 347–8) or in more radical transpositions (e.g. Braund, following Ruperti, transposes 464–6 to follow 470).

By far the most distinctive feature of the sixth Satire from the textual viewpoint is the presence in a single manuscript of lines not elsewhere attested in the MS tradition: the so-called ‘Oxford fragment’. This consists of two passages, one of 34 lines (O1–34), the other of two, occurring after 365 and 373 respectively in a manuscript (*Canon. Class. Lat.* 41) probably<sup>285</sup> written at Monte Cassino round 1100 and now held in the Bodleian library in Oxford. They were first recorded by an undergraduate, E. O. Winstedt, who had been working on textual problems in the manuscript (Winstedt 1899: 201–2).

The discovery provoked considerable scholarly debate, especially with regard to the longer passage, O1–34,<sup>286</sup> which is replete with problems, both textual and interpretational, giving rise to widespread concerns about its authenticity. Three major hypotheses have been advanced: (1) the lines are the work of a forger; (2) they belong to an earlier draft by J. which the poet later rejected; (3) they are genuine, but at some stage were lost.

(1) Those who doubt that the lines are by J. (e.g. Bücheler 1899, Knoche 1938, Axelson 1939, Reeve 1973, Willis 1989) have brought to bear arguments based on perceived difficulties with style, intelligibility and logicity of the train of thought (an approach most fully represented in Willis 1989<sup>287</sup>). In the main such arguments are subjective, though more cogent is the difficulty of explaining how the lines came to be preserved in just one of hundreds of manuscripts.<sup>288</sup> In addition, O29–34 are too similar to 346–8 for both passages to be able to stand, and since the former, unlike the latter, are inseparable from their context, 346–8 would need to be excised if the O fragment is accepted as genuine; yet these three lines seem superior to O29–34 and thus more likely to have been written by J. (Their superiority is accepted even by scholars like Courtney who take the O fragment as genuine.)

<sup>285</sup> For doubts see Parker 2012: 151.

<sup>286</sup> The second, shorter passage is now usually printed in the text as 373A–B; see n. *ad loc.*

<sup>287</sup> Most of Willis’s points are strained and unconvincing, but it should in fairness be noted that even Courtney, who accepts the authenticity of O, concedes its obscurity – regarded by Willis as proof of its inauthenticity – by observing that a number of lines have not yielded a convincing explanation: see conveniently Willis 1989: 464.

<sup>288</sup> And belonging to an inferior vulgate tradition at that (Griffith 1963: 104).

If the fragment is a forgery, it must have been composed early: the prominence of gladiators suggests a date of composition before 399, when gladiatorial contests were officially banned, and this is confirmed by the fact that the (late fourth-century) scholiast on 346–8 cites O32–3. Given, however, the unlikelihood of a forger bothering to compose such an extended piece at a time when J. was not a popular author (i.e. in the centuries after his death until the fourth century), the forger, if he existed, may well have been contemporary with J. – perhaps another satirist (Tarrant 1983: 203 n. 22).

(2) According to the so-called ‘double recension’ theory (Leo 1909, Luck 1972; opposed by Axelson 1939: 53), J. left two versions, the O lines representing an earlier draft which he later rejected, replacing it with 346–8. This would account for the perceived difficulties noted above in ascribing the lines to J. on grounds of quality, and also the apparent superiority of 346–8 in comparison with O29–34 (see above).

(3) Scholars who believe the lines to be genuine – probably the majority – need to address three difficulties: (a) how the lines came to be lost from all but one of over five hundred surviving manuscripts of J; (b) what to do about the similarity between 346–8 and O29–34; (c) why the Oxford manuscript contains *both* O29–34 and 346–8.

Of various explanations, the best is that of von Winterfeld 1899, revived by Courtney, who suggests the following scenario:

At some time prior to the late fourth century, while the text was still preserved on papyrus rolls, a column of twenty-nine lines (= O1–29) was omitted, either accidentally or (given the subject matter of the O fragment) on purpose.<sup>289</sup> This left O30–34. Line 30 now lacked a verb (i.e. *noui* in O29), and in addition, lines 32–3 (*qui nunc lascivae furta puellae | hac mercede silent*) were not fully intelligible without the preceding text. The lines were therefore adapted and reduced to three (346–8); since they did not fit well after the section on luxury (349–65) which they now followed, they were transposed to stand after 345, where the reference to Clodius fitted better with the need to guard potentially adulterous women. A marginal record of 30–34 was, however, retained, and this was the source of the scholiast’s knowledge of them (referred to above). It was from this reduced version that all Juvenalian manuscripts derived, including the Oxford manuscript, since it includes 346–8 and in all other respects appears to belong to the mainstream Juvenalian tradition. The O fragment must have been acquired by the writer of the Oxford manuscript

<sup>289</sup> The loss on a papyrus roll would be easier than in a codex version where there were double-sided pages. The best manuscript, P, and a Swiss one, Arov, both contain twenty-nine lines to a page and might have derived from a papyrus roll which also had this number.

through collation with some other manuscript deriving from an original written prior to the loss.<sup>290</sup> The notion that such a manuscript, in the form of its descendant the Oxford fragment, could have survived independently of the main textual tradition receives some support from the notorious case of the 'Helen episode' of Virgil *Aeneid* 2, where twenty-two lines of still disputed authenticity are preserved in none of the older MSS of Virgil, but only in the scholiastic tradition (cf. Luck 1972: 225–7).<sup>291</sup>

In addition to the question of authenticity, a source of disagreement, especially among those who regard O1–34 as genuine, has been their location. In the Oxford manuscript, they are placed after 349–65, on women's luxury, whereas 346–8 (the lines which supposedly replaced O30–4) follow on from the section on Clodius and women's desecration of sacred rites. Courtney's explanation, as stated above, is that when O30–4 were replaced by 346–8, the latter were transposed to stand after 345, where they fitted better. The original order, then, before the O lines were lost, would have been: Clodius and women's adultery (up to 345), women's luxury (349–65), the O fragment on *cinaedi*, women's love of eunuchs (366–78).

Some, however (esp. von Winterfeld 1899, Griffith 1963 and Luck 1972), have reversed the order of 349–65 and the O fragment, so that it comes after the Clodius passage and in the position of 346–8, which replaced it when it was lost.<sup>292</sup> Since the O lines got into the Oxford MS by contamination from another manuscript, whoever was responsible simply put them in the wrong place, it is suggested. Their arguments are: (i) 349–65 on women's *luxuria* follows the O fragment better than the Clodius passage; (ii) the transition between 345 and 349<sup>293</sup> is 'not very pleasing'; (iii) the section on Clodius and the O lines balance each other in subject matter, since in each case a man intrudes into a women's sphere (Clodius into the Bona Dea rites, the *cinaedus* into the women's household affairs).

<sup>290</sup> Note that there are parallels (e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 11–16, *Hist.* 1–4) for material known only from MSS written, as the O fragment probably was, at Monte Cassino (Griffith 1963: 105–6).

<sup>291</sup> Griffith 1963: 105–7 pointed to a similar instance, involving a single late MS containing a letter of Saint Cyprian unknown to the 180 or so other manuscripts of that author (a further copy of the letter has now turned up in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library): significantly, these MSS have affiliations with Monte Cassino, where the O manuscript probably originated. Doubts, however, have been raised about the authenticity of the letter: see Diercks 1996: Appendix v, pp. 657–60.

<sup>292</sup> A supplementary argument in favour of placing the Oxford fragment here is that the P-scholiast quotes on 348 words now known to be part of the O fragment, *qui nunc lascivae furta puellae | hac mercede silent; crimen commune tacetur*.

<sup>293</sup> The argument in question (Griffith 1963: 113) assumes the bracketing of 346–8, a doublet of O30–4, which cannot stand if the latter are accepted as genuine.

But the section on women's love for eunuchs follows on nicely from the O lines on the unmanly, but virile, *cinaedus*.<sup>294</sup> If O1–34 are retained in the sequence in which they appear in the Oxford manuscript, there is an elegant gradation in the paradoxical sexuality of the *matrona*, sex with seemingly effeminate males being followed by sex with castrates (much as the scandalous doings of Eppia 82–113 are trumped by the even more degraded behaviour of Messalina 114–32). On balance, the explanation of von Winterfeld and Courtney, which assumes authenticity while offering an explanation for the appearance of the O lines in only one manuscript, is perhaps the best offered to date. Nonetheless, problems still remain, such as the superiority of the three lines (346–8) which were allegedly added to replace the lost O29–34, and many details within the passage, not all of which can be explained in terms of lack of information (e.g. about *retiarii* in tunics O9–12): that is, various instances where the internal logic seems unsatisfactory. If the passage is indeed genuine, it is not J.'s most successful creation.

## 8 SUMMARY OF SATIRE 6

The following is intended as a rough guide to the central ideas in each section of the poem. For more detailed discussion of the thought, see the summaries which preface the commentary on the individual segments.

- 1–24 Chastity may have existed among primitive humans, but it has long since disappeared.
- 25–37 Given this, you must be mad, Postumus, to consider marrying and submitting yourself to the domination of a wife, who will be a most disagreeable bed-partner.
- 38–81 If the motivation for marriage is to get a legitimate heir, forget it: there is no such thing as a chaste woman nowadays, so that any offspring your wife produces is unlikely to be your own.
- 82–132 Sensational instances of wifely *impudicitia*, Eppia and Messalina.
- 133–5 Women's wickedness knows no bounds when it comes to gratifying their desire.
- 136–83 Counter-examples of apparently acceptable wives proffered by an interlocutor [=Postumus?]. All illusory, replies the Speaker. Even a perfect woman, if she existed, would be intolerably haughty.
- 184–99 The Hellenomaniac wife.
- 200–30 Wives exploit their husbands' love to impose domestic tyranny.

<sup>294</sup> Susanna Morton Braund takes account of this by proposing an alternative transposition, placing the section on luxury at the end: viz. Clodius (up to 345) / O fragment / eunuchs (366–78) / luxury (349–65). Nadeau 2011: 230–5 proposes a virtually identical arrangement.

- 231–41 Mothers-in-law act as procuresses for their daughters.
- 242–5 Women are endlessly litigious.
- 246–67 Women commonly engage in manly pursuits such as gladiatorial combat.
- 268–85 Wives are quarrelsome, especially in the bedroom, accusing their husbands of unfaithfulness to cloak their own infidelity.
- 286–300 Foreign *luxus* has corrupted the once chaste morals of Roman *matronae*.
- 300–13 Shocking instances of alcoholic and sexual excess, and contempt for *pudicitia*.
- 314–45 The Bona Dea rite as the occasion for a no-holds-barred sexual orgy.
- 346–8 See intro. § 7.
- 349–51 The highest and lowest of women are alike driven by lust.
- 352–65 Women squander their possessions without restraint.
- O 1–34 Wives foist on the marital household a crew of unsavoury effeminate who become their intimate confidants – and lovers.
- 366–78 Some women are turned on by sex with eunuchs.
- 379–97 Others become erotically obsessed with musicians.
- 398–412 The woman who makes a public spectacle of herself, spreading rumours domestic and international.
- 413–33 The wife who is irascible and behaves disgustingly before dinner guests.
- 434–56 The insufferable female pedant.
- 457–73 Female adornment and its connections with adultery.
- 474–507 Wives' cruelty to slaves, especially their hairdressers, prompted by unsatisfied desire and adulterous intentions.
- 508–91 Wives care little about ruining their husbands financially. In particular, they are given to superstitiousness and employ all kinds of foreign religious charlatans, putting especial faith in astrologers, or, if poor, relying for prognostication on mountebanks who haunt the Circus.
- 592–609 Upper-class women abort themselves or introduce supposititious babies into the household.
- 610–26 Wives drive their husbands mad with love-potions – a dangerous practice which led to widespread and lethal results in the case of Caligula.
- 627–61 Wives have long been expected to murder their stepsons, but nowadays they resort to killing their own offspring, if there is a financial advantage to be had. Worse than their tragic counterparts, who at least had some provocation for their actions, the women of today murder even their husbands.

D. IVNI IVVENALIS  
SATVRA VI





## D. IVNI IVVENALIS SATVRA VI

---

Credo Pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam  
in terris uisamque diu, cum frigida paruas  
praeberet spelunca domos ignemque laremque  
et pecus et dominos communi clauderet umbra,  
siluestrem montana torum cum sterneret uxor 5  
frondibus et culmo uicinarumque ferarum  
pellibus, haut similis tibi, Cynthia, nec tibi, cuius  
turbauit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos,  
sed potanda ferens infantibus ubera magnis  
et saepe horridior glandem ructante marito. 10  
quippe aliter tunc orbe nouo caeloque recenti  
uiuebant homines, qui rupto robore nati  
compositiue luto nullos habuere parentes.  
multa Pudicitiae ueteris uestigia forsan  
aut aliqua exstiterint et sub Ioue, sed Ioue nondum 15  
barbato, nondum Graecis iurare paratis  
per caput alterius, cum furem nemo timeret  
caulibus ac pomis et aperto uiueret horto.  
paulatim deinde ad superos Astraea recessit  
hac comite, atque duae pariter fugere sorores. 20  
anticum et uetus est alienum, Postume, lectum  
concutere atque sacri genium contemnere fulcri.  
omne aliud crimen mox ferrea protulit aetas:  
uiderunt primos argentea saecula moechos.  
conuentum tamen et pactum et sponsalia nostra 25  
tempestate paras iamque a tonsore magistro  
pecteris et digito pignus fortasse dedisti.  
certe sanus eras. uxorem, Postume, ducis?  
dic qua Tisiphone, quibus exagitare colubris.  
ferre potes dominam saluis tot restibus ullam, 30  
cum pateant altae caligantesque fenestrae,  
cum tibi uicinum se praebeat Aemilius pons?  
aut si de multis nullus placet exitus, illud  
nonne putas melius, quod tecum pusio dormit –  
pusio, qui noctu non litigat, exigit a te 35

nulla iacens illic munuscula, nec queritur quod  
et lateri parcas nec quantum iussit anheles?

sed placet Vrsidio lex Iulia: tollere dulcem  
cogitat heredem, cariturus turture magno  
mullorumque iubis et captatore macello. 40

quid fieri non posse putes, si iungitur ulla  
Vrsidio? si moechorum notissimus olim  
quem totiens textit perituri cista Latini 44

stulta maritali iam porrigit ora capistro? 43

quid quod et antiquis uxor de moribus illi 45

quaeritur? o medici, nimiam pertundite uenam.

delicias hominis! Tarpeium limen adora

pronus et auratam Iunoni caede iuuenecam,

si tibi contigerit capitis matrona pudici.

paucae adeo Cereris uittas contingere dignae, 50

quarum non timeat pater oscula. necte coronam

postibus et densos per limina tende corymbos!

unus Hiberinae uir sufficit? ocus illud

extorquebis, ut haec oculo contenta sit uno.

'magna tamen fama est cuiusdam rure paterno 55

uiuatis'. uiuat Gabiis ut uixit in agro,

uiuat Fidenis, et agello cedo paterno.

quis tamen affirmat nil actum in montibus aut in

speluncis? adeo senuerunt Iuppiter et Mars?

porticibusne tibi monstratur femina uoto 60

digna tuo? cuneis an habent spectacula totis

quod securus ames quodque inde excerpere possis?

chironomon Ledam molli saltante Bathyllo

Tuccia uesicae non imperat, Apula gannit,

[sicut in amplexu, subito et miserabile longum.] 65

attendit Thymele: Thymele tunc rustica discit.

ast aliae, quotiens aulaea recondita cessant,

et uacuo clausoque sonant fora sola theatro,

atque a Plebeis longe Megalesia, tristes

personam thyrsumque tenent et subligar Acci. 70

Vrbicus exodio risum mouet Atellanae

gestibus Autonoës, hunc diligit Aelia pauper.

soluitur his magno comoedi fibula, sunt quae

Chrysogonum cantare uetent, Hispulla tragoedo

gaudet: an expectas ut Quintilianus ametur? 75  
accipis uxorem de qua citharoedus Echion  
aut Glaphyrus fiat pater Ambrosiusque choraules.  
longa per angustos figamus pulpita uicos,  
ornentur postes et grandi ianua lauro,  
ut testudineo tibi, Lentule, conopeo 80  
nobilis Euryalum murmillonem exprimat infans.  
nupta senatori comitata est Eppia ludum  
ad Pharon et Nilum famosaque moenia Lagi,  
prodigia et mores urbis damnante Canopo.  
immemor illa domus et coniugis atque sororis 85  
nil patriae indulsit, plorantesque improba natos –  
utque magis stupeas – ludos Paridemque reliquit.  
sed quamquam in magnis opibus plumaque paterna  
et segmentatis dormisset paruula cunis,  
contempsit pelagus; famam contempserat olim, 90  
cuius apud molles minima est iactura cathedras.  
Tyrrhenos igitur fluctus lateque sonantem  
pertulit Ionium constanti pectore, quamuis  
mutandum totiens esset mare. iusta pericli  
si ratio est et honesta, timent pauidoque gelantur 95  
pectore nec tremulis possunt insistere plantis:  
fortem animum praestant rebus quas turpiter audent.  
si iubeat coniunx, durum est conscendere nauem,  
tunc sentina grauis, tunc summus uertitur aer:  
quae moechum sequitur, stomacho ualet. illa maritum 100  
conuomit, haec inter nautas et prandet et errat  
per puppem et duros gaudet tractare rudentes.  
qua tamen exarsit forma, qua capta iuuenta  
Eppia? quid uidit propter quod ludia dici  
sustinuit? nam Sergiolus iam radere guttur 105  
coeperat et secto requiem sperare lacerto;  
praeterea multa in facie deformia: sulcus  
attritus galea mediisque in naribus ingens  
gibbus et acre malum semper stillantis ocelli.  
sed gladiator erat. facit hoc illos Hyacinthos; 110  
hoc pueris patriaeque, hoc praetulit illa sorori  
atque uiro. ferrum est quod amant. hic Sergius idem  
accepta rude coepisset Veiento uideri.

quid priuata domus, quid fecerit Eppia, curas?  
 respice riuales diuorum, Claudius audi 115  
 quae tulerit. dormire uirum cum senserat uxor,  
 sumere nocturnos meretrix Augusta cucullos 118  
 ausa Palatino et tegetem praeferre cubili 117  
 linquebat comite ancilla non amplius una.  
 sic nigrum flauo crinem abscondente galero 120  
 intrauit calidum ueteri centone lupanar  
 et cellam uacuam atque suam; tunc nuda papillis  
 prostitit auratis titulum mentita Lyciscae  
 ostenditque tuum, generose Britannice, uentrem.  
 excepit blanda intrantes atque aera poposcit. 125  
 [continueque iacens cunctorum absorbuit ictus.]  
 mox lenone suas iam dimittente puellas  
 tristis abit, et quod potuit tamen ultima cellam  
 clausit, adhuc ardens rigidae tentigine uoluae,  
 et lassata uiris necdum satiata recessit, 130  
 obscurisque genis turpis fumoque lucernae  
 foeda lupanaris tulit ad puluinar odorem.  
 hippomanes carmenque loquar coctumque uenenum  
 priuignoque datum? faciunt grauiora coactae  
 imperio sexus summumque libidine peccant. 135  
 ‘optima sed quare Caesennia teste marito?’  
 bis quingena dedit. tanti uocat ille pudicam,  
 [nec pharetris Veneris macer est aut lampade feruet:]  
 inde faces ardent, ueniunt a dote sagittae.  
 libertas emitur. coram licet innuat atque 140  
 rescribat: uidua est, locuples quae nupsit auaro.  
 ‘cur desiderio Bibulae Sertorius ardet?’  
 si uerum excutias, facies non uxor amatur.  
 tres rugae subeant et se cutis arida laxet,  
 fiant obscuri dentes oculique minores, 145  
 ‘collige sarcinulas’ dicet libertus ‘et exi.  
 iam grauis es nobis et saepe emungeris. exi  
 ocus et propera. sicco uenit altera naso.’  
 interea calet et regnat poscitque maritum  
 pastores et ouem Canusinam ulmosque Falernas – 150  
 quantulum in hoc! – pueros omnes, ergastula tota,  
 quodque domi non est, sed habet uicinus, ematur.

mense quidem brumae, cum iam mercator Iason  
 clausus et armatis obstat casa candida nautis,  
 grandia tolluntur crystallina, maxima rursus 155  
 murrina, deinde adamas notissimus et Beronices  
 in digito factus pretiosior. hunc dedit olim  
 barbarus incestae gestare Agrippa sorori,  
 observant ubi festa mero pede sabbata reges  
 et uetus indulget senibus clementia porcis. 160

‘nullane de tantis gregibus tibi digna uidetur?’  
 sit formonsa, decens, diues, fecunda, uetustos  
 porticibus disponat auos, intactor omni  
 crinibus effusis bellum dirimente Sabina,  
 rara auis in terris nigroque simillima cycno, 165  
 quis feret uxorem cui constant omnia? malo,  
 malo Venustinam quam te, Cornelia, mater  
 Gracchorum, si cum magnis uirtutibus affers  
 grande supercilium et numeras in dote triumphos.  
 tolle tuum, precor, Hannibalem uictumque Syphacem 170  
 in castris et cum tota Carthagine migra.

‘parce, precor, Paeon, et tu, dea, pone sagittas;  
 nil pueri faciunt, ipsam configite matrem’  
 Amphion clamat, sed Paeon contrahit arcum.  
 extulit ergo greges natorum ipsumque parentem, 175  
 dum sibi nobilior Latonae gente uidetur  
 atque eadem scrofa Niobe fecundior alba.  
 quae tanti grauitas, quae forma, ut se tibi semper  
 imputet? huius enim rari summique uoluptas  
 nulla boni, quotiens animo corrupta superbo 180  
 plus aloes quam mellis habet. quis deditus autem  
 usque adeo est, ut non illam quam laudibus effert  
 horreat inque diem septenis oderit horis?

quaedam parua quidem, sed non toleranda maritis.  
 nam quid rancidius quam quod se non putat ulla 185  
 formosam nisi quae de Tusca Graecula facta est,  
 de Sulmonensi mera Cecropis? omnia Graece:  
 [cum sit turpe magis nostris nescire Latine.]  
 hoc sermone pauent, hoc iram, gaudia, curas,  
 hoc cuncta effundunt animi secreta. quid ultra? 190  
 concumbunt Graece. dones tamen ista puellis,

tune etiam, quam sextus et octogensimus annus  
 pulsat, adhuc Graece? non est hic sermo pudicus  
 in uetula. quotiens lascium interuenit illud  
 ζῶῃ καὶ ψυχῇ, modo sub lodice loquendis 195  
 uteris in turba. quod enim non excitet inguen  
 uox blanda et nequam? digitos habet. ut tamen omnes  
 subsidant pinnae, dicas haec mollius Haemo  
 quamquam et Carpophoro, facies tua computat annos.  
 si tibi legitimis pactam iunctamque tabellis 200  
 non es amaturus, ducendi nulla uidetur  
 causa, nec est quare cenam et mustacea perdas  
 labente officio crudis donanda, nec illud  
 quod prima pro nocte datur, cum lance beata  
 DACICVS et scripto radiat GERMANICVS auro. 205  
 si tibi simplicitas uxoriam, deditus uni  
 est animus, summitte caput ceruice parata  
 ferre iugum. nullam inuenies quae parcat amanti.  
 [ardeat ipsa licet, tormentis gaudet amantis  
 et spoliis; igitur longe minus utilis illi 210  
 uxor, quisquis erit bonus optandusque maritus.]  
 nil umquam inuita donabis coniuge, uendes  
 hac obstante nihil, nihil haec si nolet emetur.  
 haec dabit affectus: ille excludatur amicus  
 iam senior, cuius barbam tua ianua uidit. 215  
 testandi cum sit lenonibus atque lanistis  
 libertas et iuris idem contingat harenae,  
 non unus tibi riualis dictabitur heres.  
 ‘pone crucem seruo.’ ‘meruit quo crimine seruus  
 supplicium? quis testis adest? quis detulit? audi; 220  
 nulla umquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est.’  
 ‘o demens, ita seruus homo est? nil fecerit, esto:  
 hoc uolo, sic iubeo, sit pro ratione uoluntas.’  
 imperat ergo uiro. sed mox haec regna relinquit  
 permutatque domos et flammea conterit; inde 225  
 auolat et spreti repetit uestigia lecti.  
 ornatas paulo ante fores, pendentia linquit  
 uela domus et adhuc uirides in limine ramos.  
 sic crescit numerus, sic fiunt octo mariti  
 quinque per autumnos, titulo res digna sepulcri. 230

desperanda tibi salua concordia socru.  
 illa docet spoliis nudi gaudere mariti,  
 illa docet missis a corruptore tabellis  
 nil rude nec simplex rescribere, decipit illa  
 custodes aut aere domat. tum corpore sano 235  
 aduocat Archigenen onerosaque pallia iactat.  
 abditus interea latet et secretus adulter  
 impatiensque morae silet et praeputia ducit.  
 scilicet expectas ut tradat mater honestos  
 atque alios mores quam quos habet? utile porro 240  
 filiolum turpi uetulae producere turpem.

nulla fere causa est in qua non femina litem  
 mouerit. accusat Manilia, si rea non est.  
 componunt ipsae per se formantque libellos,  
 principium atque locos Celso dictare paratae. 245

endromidas Tyrias et femineum ceroma  
 quis nescit, uel quis non uidit uulnera pali,  
 quem cauat assiduis rudibus scutoque lacessit  
 atque omnes implet numeros dignissima prorsus  
 Florali matrona tuba, nisi si quid in illo 250  
 pectore plus agitat ueraeque paratur harenae?  
 quem praestare potest mulier galeata pudorem,  
 quae fugit a sexu? uires amat. haec tamen ipsa  
 uir nollet fieri; nam quantula nostra uoluptas!  
 quale decus, rerum si coniugis auctio fiat, 255  
 balteus et manicae et cristae crurisque sinistri  
 dimidium tegimen! uel si diuersa mouebit  
 proelia, tu felix ocreas uendente puella.  
 hae sunt quae tenui sudant in cyclade, quarum  
 delicias et panniculus bombycinus urit. 260

aspice quo fremitu monstratos perferat ictus  
 et quanto galeae curuetur pondere, quanta  
 poplitibus sedeat quam denso fascia libro,  
 et ride positis scaphium cum sumitur armis.  
 dicite uos, neptes Lepidi caeciae Metelli 265  
 Gurgitis aut Fabii, quae ludia sumpserit umquam  
 hos habitus? quando ad palum gemat uxor Asyli?

semper habet lites alternaque iurgia lectus  
 in quo nupta iacet; minimum dormitur in illo.



tum grauis illa uiro, tunc orba tigride peior, 270  
 cum simulat gemitus occulti conscia facti.  
 aut odit pueros aut ficta paelice plorat  
 uberibus semper lacrimis semperque paratis  
 in statione sua atque expectantibus illam,  
 quo iubeat manare modo. tu credis amorem, 275  
 tu tibi tunc, uruca, places fletumque labellis  
 exorbes, quae scripta et quot lecture tabellas  
 si tibi zelotypae retegantur scrinia moechae!  
 sed iacet in serui complexibus aut equitis. 'dic,  
 dic aliquem sodes hic, Quintiliane, colorem.' 280  
 'haeremus. dic ipsa.' 'olim conuenerat' inquit  
 'ut faceres tu quod uelles, nec non ego possem  
 indulgere mihi. clames licet et mare caelo  
 confundas, homo sum.' nihil est audacius illis  
 deprensus: iram atque animos a crimine sumunt. 285  
 unde haec monstra tamen uel quo de fonte requiris?  
 praestabat castas humilis fortuna Latinas  
 quondam, nec uitii contingi parua sinebant  
 tecta labor somnique breues et uellere Tusco  
 uexatae duraeque manus ac proximus urbi 290  
 Hannibal et stantes Collina turre mariti.  
 nunc patimur longae pacis mala, saeuior armis  
 luxuria incubuit uictumque ulciscitur orbem.  
 nullum crimen abest facinusque libidinis ex quo  
 paupertas Romana perit. hinc fluxit ad istos 295  
 et Sybaris colles, hinc et Rhodos et Miletos  
 atque coronatum et petulans madidumque Tarentum.  
 prima peregrinos obscena pecunia mores  
 intulit, et turpi fregerunt saecula luxu  
 diuitiae molles. quid enim uenus ebria curat? 300  
 inguinis et capitis quae sint discrimina nescit  
 grandia quae mediis iam noctibus ostrea mordet,  
 cum perfusa mero spumant unguenta Falerno,  
 cum bibitur concha, cum iam uertigine tectum  
 ambulat et geminis exsurgit mensa lucernis. 305  
 i nunc et dubita qua sorbeat aera sanna  
 Tullia, quid dicat notae collactea Maurae  
 Maura, Pudicitiae ueterem cum praeterit aram.

noctibus hic ponunt lecticas, micturiunt hic  
 effigiemque deae longis siphonibus implent 310  
 inque uices equitant ac Luna teste mouentur,  
 inde domos abeunt: tu calcas luce reuersa  
 coniugis urinam magnos uisurus amicos.

nota Bonae secreta Deae, cum tibia lumbos  
 incitat et cornu pariter uinoque feruntur 315  
 attonitae crinemque rotant ululantque Priapi  
 maenades. o quantus tunc illis mentibus ardor  
 concubitus, quae uox saltante libidine, quantus  
 ille meri ueteris per crura madentia torrens!

lenonum ancillas posita Saufeia corona 320  
 prouocat et tollit pendentis praemia coxae,  
 ipsa Medullinae fluctum crisantis adorat:  
 palma inter dominas, uirtus natalibus aequa.  
 nil ibi per ludum simulabitur, omnia fient  
 ad uerum, quibus incendi iam frigidus aeuo 325  
 Laomedontiades et Nestoris hirnea possit.

tunc prurigo morae impatiens, tum femina simplex,  
 ac pariter toto repetitus clamor ab antro  
 'iam fas est, admitte uiros.' dormitat adulter,  
 illa iubet sumpto iuuenem properare cucullo; 330  
 si nihil est, seruis incurritur; abstuleris spem

seruorum, uenit et conductus aquarius; hic si  
 quaeritur et desunt homines, mora nulla per ipsam  
 quo minus imposito clunem summittat asello.

atque utinam ritus ueteres et publica saltem 335  
 his intacta malis agerentur sacra; sed omnes  
 nouerunt Mauri atque Indi quae psaltria penem  
 maiorem quam sunt duo Caesaris Anticatones  
 illuc, testiculi sibi conscius unde fugit mus,

intulerit, ubi uelari pictura iubetur 340  
 quaecumque alterius sexus imitata figuras.

et quis tunc hominum contemptor numinis, aut quis  
 simpuium ridere Numae nigrumque catinum  
 et Vaticano fragiles de monte patellas  
 ausus erat? sed nunc ad quas non Clodius aras? 345

[audio quid ueteres olim moneatis amici,  
 'pone seram, cohibe.' sed quis custodiet ipsos

custodes? cauta est et ab illis incipit uxor.]	
iamque eadem summis pariter minimisque libido,	
nec melior silicem pedibus quae conterit atrum	350
quam quae longorum uehitur ceruice Syrorum.	
ut spectet ludos, conduit Ogulnia uestem,	
conduit comites, sellam, ceruical, amicas,	
nutricem et flauam cui det mandata puellam.	
haec tamen argenti superest quodcumque paterni	355
leuibus athleticis et uasa nouissima donat.	
multis res angusta domi, sed nulla pudorem	
paupertatis habet nec se metitur ad illum	
quem dedit haec posuitque modum. tamen utile quid sit	
prospiciunt aliquando uiri, frigusque famemque	360
formica tandem quidam expauere magistra:	
prodiga non sentit pereuntem femina censum;	
ac uelut exhausta recidiuus pullulet arca	
nummus et e pleno tollatur semper aceruo,	
non umquam reputant quanti sibi gaudia constant.	365
in quacumque domo uiuit ludique professus	O1
obscenum, et tremula promittens omnia dextra,	O2
inuenies omnes turpes similesque cinaedis.	O3
his uiolare cibos sacraeque assistere mensae	O4
permittunt, et uasa iubent frangenda lauari	O5
cum colocyntha bibit uel cum barbata chelidon.	O6
purior ergo tuis laribus meliorque lanista,	O7
in cuius numero longe migrare iubetur	O8
psellus ab euphono. quid quod nec retia turpi	O9
iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem	O10
munimenta umeri †pulsatamque arma† tridentem	O11
qui nudus pugnare solet? pars ultima ludi	O12
accipit has animas aliusque in carcere neruos.	O13
sed tibi communem calicem facit uxor et illis	O14
cum quibus Albanum Surrentinumque recuset	O15
flaua ruinosi lupa degustare sepulchri.	O16
horum consiliis nubunt subitaeque recedunt,	O17
his languentem animum reserant et seria uitae,	O18
his clunem atque latus discunt uibrare magistris,	O19
quicquid praeterea scit qui docet. haud tamen illi	O20
semper habenda fides: oculos fuligine pascit	O21

discinctus croceis et reticulatus adulter.	O 22
suspectus tibi sit, quanto uox mollior et quo	O 23
saepius in teneris haerebit dextera lumbis.	O 24
hic erit in lecto fortissimus; exuit illic	O 25
personam docili Thais saltata Triphallo.	O 26
quem rides? aliis hunc mimum! sponsio fiat:	O 27
purum te contendo uirum. contendo: fateris?	O 28
an uocat ancillas tortoris pergula? noui	O 29
consilia et ueteres quaecumque monetis amici,	O 30
'pone seram, cohibe.' sed quis custodiet ipsos	O 31
custodes, qui nunc lasciuae furta puellae	O 32
hac mercede silent? crimen commune tacetur.	O 33
prospicit hoc prudens et ab illis incipit uxor.	O 34
sunt quas eunuchi imbelles ac mollia semper	366
oscula delectent et desperatio barbae	
et quod abortiuo non est opus. illa uoluptas	
summa tamen, quom iam calida matura iuuenta	
inguina traduntur medicis, iam pectine nigro.	370
ergo expectatos ac iussos crescere primum	
testiculos, postquam coeperunt esse bilibres,	
tonsoris tantum damno rapit Heliodorus.	
mangonum pueros uera ac miserabilis urit	373A
debilitas, follisque pudet cicerisque relictis.	373B
conspicius longe cunctisque notabilis intrat	
balnea nec dubie custodem uitis et horti	375
prouocat a domina factus spado. dormiat ille	
cum domina, sed tu iam durum, Postume, iamque	
tondendum eunucho Bromium committere noli.	
si gaudet cantu, nullius fibula durat	
uocem uendentis praetoribus. organa semper	380
in manibus, densi radiant testudine tota	
sardonyches, crispo numerantur pectine chordae	
quo tener Hedymeles operas dedit: hunc tenet, hoc se	
solatur gratoque indulget basia plectro.	
quaedam de numero Lamiarum ac nominis Appi	385
et farre et uino Ianum Vestamque rogabat,	
an Capitolinam deberet Pollio quercum	
sperare et fidibus promittere. quid faceret plus	
aegrotante uiro, medicis quid tristibus erga	

filiolum? stetit ante aram nec turpe putauit 390  
 pro cithara uelare caput dictataque uerba  
 pertulit, ut mos est, et aperta palluit agna.  
 dic mihi nunc, quaeso, dic, antiquissime diuom,  
 respondes his, Iane pater? magna otia caeli;  
 non est, quod uideo, non est quod agatur apud uos. 395  
 haec de comoedis te consulit, illa tragoedum  
 commendare solet: uaricosus fiet haruspex.  
 sed cantet potius quam totam peruolet urbem  
 audax et coetus possit quae ferre uirorum  
 cumque paludatis ducibus praesente marito 400  
 ipsa loqui recta facie siccisque mamillis.  
 haec eadem nouit quid toto fiat in orbe,  
 quid Seres, quid Thraces agant, secreta nouercae  
 et pueri, quis amet, quis diripiat adulter;  
 dicet quis uiduam praegnatem fecerit et quo 405  
 mense, quibus uerbis concumbat quaeque, modis quot.  
 instantem regi Armenio Parthoque cometen  
 prima uidet, famam rumoresque illa recentes  
 excipit ad portas, quosdam facit; isse Niphaten  
 in populos magnoque illic cuncta arua teneri 410  
 diluuiο, nutare urbes, subsidere terras,  
 quocumque in triuio, cuicumque est obuia, narrat.  
 nec tamen id uitium magis intolerabile quam quae  
 uicinos humiles rapere et concidere loris  
 exsecrata solet. nam si latratibus alti 415  
 rumpuntur somni, 'fustes huc ocus' inquit  
 'afferte' atque illis dominum iubet ante feriri,  
 deinde canem. grauis occursu, taeterrima uultu  
 balnea nocte subit, conchas et castra moueri  
 nocte iubet, magno gaudet sudare tumultu, 420  
 cum lassata graui ceciderunt bracchia massa,  
 callidus et cristae digitos impressit aliptes  
 ac summum dominae femur exclamare coegit.  
 conuiuae miseri interea somnoque fameque  
 urguntur. tandem illa uenit rubicundula, totum 425  
 oenophorum sitiens, plena quod tenditur urna  
 admotum pedibus, de quo sextarius alter  
 ducitur ante cibum rabidam facturus orexim,

dum redit et loto terram ferit intestino.  
 marmoribus riui properant, aurata Falernum 430  
 peluis olet; nam sic, tamquam alta in dolia longus  
 deciderit serpens, bibit et uomit. ergo maritus  
 nauseat atque oculis bilem substringit opertis.

illa tamen grauior, quae cum discumbere coepit  
 laudat Vergilium, periturae ignoscit Elissae, 435  
 committit uates et comparat, inde Maronem  
 atque alia parte in trutina suspendit Homerum.  
 cedunt grammatici, uincuntur rhetores, omnis  
 turba tacet, nec causidicus nec praeco loquetur,  
 altera nec mulier: uerborum tanta cadit uis, 440

tot pariter pelues ac tintinnabula dicas  
 pulsari. iam nemo tubas, nemo aera fatiget:  
 una laboranti poterit succurrere Lunae.  
 imponit finem sapiens et rebus honestis;  
 nam quae docta nimis cupit et facunda uideri 445  
 crure tenus medio tunicas succingere debet,  
 caedere Siluano porcum, quadrante lauari.  
 non habeat matrona, tibi quae iuncta recumbit,  
 dicendi genus, aut curuum sermone rotato  
 torqueat enthymema, nec historias sciat omnes, 450  
 sed quaedam ex libris et non intellegat. odi  
 hanc ego quae repetit uoluitque Palaemonis artem  
 seruata semper lege et ratione loquendi  
 ignotosque mihi tenet antiquaria uersus  
 nec curanda uiris. opicae castiget amicae 455  
 uerba: soloecismum liceat fecisse marito.

nil non permittit mulier sibi, turpe putat nil,  
 cum uirides gemmas collo circumdedit et cum  
 auribus extentis magnos commisit elenchos.  
 [intolerabilius nihil est quam femina diues.] 460  
 interea foeda aspectu ridendaque multo  
 pane tumet facies aut pingua Poppaeana  
 spirat et hinc miseri uiscantur labra mariti.  
 ad moechum lota ueniunt cute. quando uideri  
 uult formonsa domi? moechis foliata parantur, 465  
 his emitur quidquid graciles huc mittitis Indi.  
 tandem aperit uultum et tectoria prima reponit,

incipit agnosci, atque illo lacte fouetur  
 propter quod secum comites educat asellas  
 exul Hyperboreum si dimittatur ad axem. 470  
 sed quae mutatis inducitur atque fouetur  
 tot medicaminibus coctaeque siliginis offas  
 accipit et madidae, facies dicetur an ulcus?  
 est pretium curae penitus cognoscere toto  
 quid faciant agitentque die. si nocte maritus 475  
 auersus iacuit, periit libraria, ponunt  
 cosmetae tunicas, tarde uenisse Liburnus  
 dicitur et poenas alieni pendere somni  
 cogitur, hic frangit ferulas, rubet ille flagello,  
 hic scutica; sunt quae tortoribus annua praestent. 480  
 uerberat atque obiter faciem linit, audit amicas  
 aut latum pictae uestis considerat aurum  
 et caedit, longi relegit transuersa diurni  
 et caedit, donec lassis caedentibus 'exi'  
 intonet horrendum iam cognitione peracta. 485  
 praefectura domus Sicala non mitior aula.  
 nam si constituit solitoque decentius optat  
 ornari et properat iamque expectatur in hortis  
 aut apud Isiacae potius sacraria lenae,  
 disponit crinem laceratis ipsa capillis 490  
 nuda umeros Psecas infelix nudisque mamillis.  
 'altior hic quare cincinnus?' taurea punit  
 continuo flexi crimen facinusque capilli.  
 quid Psecas admisit? quatenam est hic culpa puellae,  
 si tibi displicuit nasus tuus? altera laeuum 495  
 extendit pectusque comas et uoluit in orbem.  
 est in consilio materna admotaque lanis  
 emerita quae cessat acu; sententia prima  
 huius erit, post hanc aetate atque arte minores  
 censebunt, tamquam famae discrimen agatur 500  
 aut animae: tanta est quaerendi cura decoris.  
 tot premit ordinibus, tot adhuc compagibus altum  
 aedificat caput: Andromachen a fronte uidebis,  
 post minor est, credas aliam. cedo si breue parui  
 sortita est lateris spatium breuiorque uidetur 505  
 uirgine Pygmaea nullis adiuta coturnis  
 et leuis erecta consurgit ad oscula planta.

nulla uiri cura interea nec mentio fiet  
 damnorum. uiuit tamquam uicina mariti,  
 hoc solo propior, quod amicos coniugis odit 510  
 et seruos, grauis est rationibus. ecce furentis  
 Bellonae matrisque deum chorus intrat et ingens  
 semiuir, obsceno facies reuerenda minori,  
 mollia qui rapta secuit genitalia testa  
 iam pridem, cui rauca cohors, cui tympana cedunt 515  
 plebeia et Phrygia uestitur bucca tiara.  
 grande sonat metuique iubet Septembris et austri  
 aduentum, nisi se centum lustrauerit ouis  
 et xerampelinas ueteres donauerit ipsi,  
 ut quidquid subiti et magni discriminis instat 520  
 in tunicas eat et totum semel expiet annum.  
 hibernum fracta glacie descendet in amnem,  
 ter matutino Tiberi mergetur et ipsis  
 uerticibus timidum caput abluet, inde superbi  
 totum regis agrum nuda ac tremibunda cruentis 525  
 erepet genibus; si candida iusserit Io,  
 ibit ad Aegypti finem calidaque petitas  
 a Meroe portabit aquas, ut spargat in aede  
 Isidis, antiquo quae proxima surgit ouili.  
 credit enim ipsius dominae se uoce moneri. 530  
 en animam et mentem cum qua di nocte loquantur!  
 ergo hic praecipuum summumque meretur honorem  
 qui grege linigero circumdatus et grege caluo  
 plangentis populi currit derisor Anubis.  
 ille petit ueniam, quotiens non abstinet uxor 535  
 concubitu sacris obseruandisque diebus  
 magnaue debetur uiolato poena cadurco  
 et mouisse caput uisa est argentea serpens;  
 illius lacrimae meditataque murmura praestant  
 ut ueniam culpa non abnuat ansere magno 540  
 scilicet et tenui popano corruptus Osiris.  
 cum dedit ille locum, cophino fenoque relicto  
 arcanam Iudaea tremens mendicat in aurem,  
 interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos  
 arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli. 545  
 implet et illa manum, sed parcius; aere minuto  
 qualiacumque uoles Iudaei somnia uendunt.



spondet amatorem tenerum uel diuitis orbi  
 testamentum ingens calidae pulmone columbae  
 tractato Armenius uel Commagenus haruspex; 550  
 pectora pullorum rimabitur, exta catelli  
 interdum et pueri; faciet quod deferat ipse.  
 Chaldaeis sed maior erit fiducia: quidquid  
 dixerit astrologus, credent a fonte relatum  
 Hammonis, quoniam Delphis oracula cessant 555  
 et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri.  
 praecipuus tamen est horum, qui saepius exul.  
 [cuius amicitia conducendaque tabella  
 magnus ciuis obit et formidatus Othoni]  
 inde fides artis, sonuit si dextera ferro. 560  
 [laeuaque, si longe castrorum in carcere mansit.]  
 nemo mathematicus genium indemnatus habebit,  
 sed qui paene perit, cui uix in Cyclada mitti  
 contigit et parua tandem caruisse Seripho.  
 consulit ictericae lento de funere matris, 565  
 ante tamen de te Tanaquil tua, quando sororem  
 efferat et patruos, an sit uicturus adulter  
 post ipsam; quid enim maius dare numina possunt?  
 haec tamen ignorat quid sidus triste minetur  
 Saturni, quo laeta Venus se proferat astro, 570  
 quis mensis damnis, quae dentur tempora lucro:  
 illius occursus etiam uitare memento,  
 in cuius manibus ceu pingua sucina tritas  
 cernis ephemeridas, quae nullum consulit et iam  
 consulitur, quae castra uiro patriamque petente 575  
 non ibit pariter numeris reuocata Thrasylli.  
 ad primum lapidem uectari cum placet, hora  
 sumitur ex libro; si prurit frictus ocelli  
 angulus, inspecta genesi collyria poscit;  
 aegra licet iaceat, capiendo nulla uidetur 580  
 aptior hora cibo nisi quam dederit Petosiris.  
 si mediocris erit, spatium lustrabit utrimque  
 metarum et sortes ducet frontemque manumque  
 praebebit uati crebrum poppysma roganti.  
 diuitibus responsa dabit Phryx augur et inde 585  
 conductus, dabit astrorum mundique peritus  
 atque aliquis senior qui publica fulgura condit.

plebeium in circo positum est et in aggere fatum.  
 quae nudis longum ostendit ceruicibus aurum  
 consulit ante falas delphinorumque columnas  
 an saga uendenti nubat caupone relicto. 590

hae tamen et partus subeunt discrimen et omnes  
 nutricis tolerant fortuna urgente labores,  
 sed iacet aurato uix ulla puerpera lecto.  
 tantum artes huius, tantum medicamina possunt, 595

quae steriles facit atque homines in uentre necandos  
 conducit. gaude, infelix, atque ipse bibendum  
 porrige quidquid erit; nam si distendere uellet  
 et uexare uterum pueris salientibus, esses  
 Aethiopis fortasse pater, mox decolor heres 600  
 impleret tabulas numquam tibi mane uidendus.

transeo suppositos et gaudia uotaque saepe  
 ad spurcos decepta lacus, saepe inde petitos  
 pontifices, Salios Scaurorum nomina falso  
 corpore laturos. stat Fortuna improba noctu 605  
 arridens nudis infantibus: hos fouet omni  
 inuoluitque sinu, domibus tunc porrigit altis  
 secretumque sibi mimum parat; hos amat, his se  
 ingerit utque suos semper producit alumnos.

hic magicos affert cantus, hic Thessala uendit 610  
 philtra, quibus ualeat mentem uexare mariti  
 et solea pulsare nates. quod desipis, inde est,  
 inde animi caligo et magna obliuio rerum  
 quas modo gessisti. tamen hoc tolerabile, si non  
 [semper aquam portes rimosa ad dolia, semper 614A  
 istud onus subeas ipsis manantibus urnis, 614B  
 quo rabidus nostro Phalarim de rege dedisti.] 614C

et furere incipias ut auunculus ille Neronis,  
 cui totam tremuli frontem Caesonia pulli  
 infudit. quae non faciet quod principis uxor?  
 ardebant cuncta et fracta compage ruebant  
 non aliter quam si fecisset Iuno maritum  
 insanum. minus ergo nocens erit Agrippinae 620  
 boletus, siquidem unius praecordia pressit  
 ille senis tremulumque caput descendere iussit  
 in caelum et longa manantia labra salia:  
 haec poscit ferrum atque ignes, haec potio torquet,

haec lacerat mixtos equitum cum sanguine patres. 625  
 tanti partus equae, tanti una uenefica constat.  
 oderunt natos de paelice; nemo repugnet,  
 nemo uetet, iam iam priuignum occidere fas est.  
 uos quoque, pupilli, moneo, quibus amplior est res,  
 custodite animas et nulli credite mensae: 630  
 liuida materno feruent adipata ueneno.  
 mordeat ante aliquis quidquid porrexerit illa  
 quae peperit, timidus praegustet pocula papas.  
 fingimus haec altum satura sumente coturnum  
 scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum 635  
 grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu,  
 montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino?  
 nos utinam uani! sed clamat Pontia 'feci,  
 confiteor, puerisque meis aconita paraui,  
 quae deprensa patent; facinus tamen ipsa peregi.' 640  
 tune duos una, saeuissima uipera, cena?  
 tune duos? 'septem, si septem forte fuissent.'  
 credamus tragicis quidquid de Colchide torua  
 dicitur et Procne; nil contra conor. et illae  
 grandia monstra suis audebant temporibus, sed 645  
 non propter nummos. minor admiratio summis  
 debetur monstris, quotiens facit ira nocentes  
 hunc sexum et rabie iecur incendente feruntur  
 praecipites, ut saxa iugis abrupta, quibus mons  
 subtrahitur cliuoque latus pendente recedit. 650  
 illam ego non tulerim quae computat et scelus ingens  
 sana facit. spectant subeuntem fata mariti  
 Alcestim et, similis si permutatio detur,  
 morte uiri cupiant animam seruare catellae.  
 occurrent multae tibi Belides atque Eriphylae 655  
 mane, Clytemestram nullus non uicus habebit.  
 hoc tantum refert, quod Tyndaris illa bipennem  
 insulsam et fatuam dextra laeuaque tenebat;  
 at nunc res agitur tenui pulmone rubetae,  
 sed tamen et ferro, si praegustarit Atrides 660  
 Pontica ter uicti cautus medicamina regis.

## COMMENTARY

---

1–24 *It may be true that Chastity lingered upon the earth in the early, rural phase of human existence, when wives were coarse and unsophisticated, unlike the libertine ladies of latter days. Perhaps too traces of her remained at the very beginning of the Silver Age. But afterwards she gradually migrated to heaven. Adultery, Postumus, started in the Silver era: other crimes began much later, in the Iron Age.*

J.'s arguments against marriage in the first half of the Satire centre on the impossibility of finding a wife who will be sexually faithful (*pudica*). Accordingly, he begins with a prologue which demonstrates that adultery is so long-established that *pudicitia* is to be sought only in the most remote past. It assumes the form of a playful, characteristically Juvenalian take on the Myth of the Ages, first found in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, whereby the goddess Pudicitia is substituted for Hesiod's Aidos or the Maiden Justice of later versions (see *moratam* 1, 19–20nn.), the primordial colour of the passage being reinforced syntactically by the opening ten-line period, 'itself an archaic feature' (Kenney 2012: 127). J. is also influenced by Propertius' association of *pudicitia* with the Golden Age (2.32.49–56).

In keeping with the Satire's main theme – Roman *matronae* – the section on the Golden Age (1–13) focuses not on primitive humans in general, as in other versions of the myth, but on a woman who is the paradigm of the ideal *matrona*: homemaker (*domos, laremque* 3), sharer of her husband's bed (5n.) and mother to his children (9). But J. superimposes onto the Hesiodic material the 'hard primitivism' of Lucretius, with the result that the ideal woman and her lifestyle are made to seem far from attractive. The Lucretian coloration is reinforced in lines 9–10, which recall the Roman ideal whereby a pristine rustic simplicity is allied to moral innocence, especially of women (e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 2, Virg. *G.* 2.523–35, Tib. 1.5.21–34) – but, importantly, the lines are infused with an irony which recalls a similarly debunking treatment by writers such as Ovid: see 10n.

This satiric treatment of the matronal paragon, which undermines its paradigmatic value, has sometimes been interpreted as indicating a preference on the part of the Speaker for the sophisticated but adulterous women of the present, such as Cynthia and Lesbia (7–8); but it is better to see it as programmatically establishing the character of the Speaker as a misogynist whose intolerance of women extends even to those who represent the ideal (Watson 2012). See further: Singleton 1972, Nardo 1973: 5–27, Winkler 1983: 27–31, Bellandi 1991, 2003: 57–93, Keane 2002, Plaza 2006: 325–8.

The prologue has various other programmatic functions: see intro. § 2(a).

**1 credo** ‘I believe’ introduces the mythological theme of 1–20 (and instantly foregrounds the Speaker and the theme of poetic voice, as do the opening words of the first book of J.’s *Satires*, *semper ego?*). The train of thought is: ‘I’m prepared to accept the myth of Golden Age innocence, but doubt whether it lasted much beyond that period (cf. *forsan* 14); adultery is the oldest crime, and though perhaps not universal in the Silver Age, it had certainly started by then.’ Given, however, that *credo* can be used ironically (*OLD* s.v. 8c), J. may be insinuating doubts about the prevalence of *pudicitia* even in the Golden Age (*Saturno rege*). **Pudicitiam**: the sexual fidelity of a wife to her husband and the cardinal virtue of a Roman *matrona* (Braund 1992a: 81–2, P. Watson 2005: 81; Langlands 2006: 2, 29–32; also 39–57, the goddess *Pudicitia*). The appearance of the word at the outset of the poem underlines its thematic importance both to the prologue and to the Satire as a whole. **Saturno rege** ‘when Saturnus was king’ i.e. in the Golden Age: cf. Tib. 1.3.35 *quam bene Saturno uiuebant rege!* Saturn, an old Italian god of agriculture, was identified with the Greek Kronos, whose ousting by his son Jupiter marked the transition from the Golden to the Silver Age: cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.113–15 *postquam, Saturno tenebrosa in Tartara misso, | sub Ioue mundus erat, subiit argentea proles, | auro deterior. moratam* ‘lingered’, along with *diu* (2), emphasises that *Pudicitia*’s stay on earth was long-lasting. The picture (1–20) of her dwelling among humans in the Golden Age, being less in evidence in the Silver, and eventually withdrawing altogether, is inspired by Aratus’ account of the maiden Justice (*Phaen.* 100–36).

**2 uisamque**: in the age of innocence, gods were visible to humans: cf. Catull. 64.384–6 *praesentes namque ante domos inuisere castas | heroum, et sese mortali ostendere coetu, | caelicolae nondum sprete pietate solebant.*

**2–4 cum frigida ... | ... | ... umbra** introduces the first note of ‘hard’ primitivism, by depicting a family in the Age of Saturn making their home in a cave. J. here conflates two stages in mythic accounts of human development. Both Ovid’s Golden Age people and Lucretius’ hardy primitives occupied caves, but these were not homes in any meaningful sense, merely one of a number of locations where they might pernoctate or take shelter (Ov. *Met.* 1.121–2, Lucr. 5.955–7, 982–7). Occupation of homes came later (Ov. *ibid.* *tum primum* [sc. in the Silver Age] *subiere domos. domus antra fuerunt* [sc. *antea*] | *et densi frutices et uinctae cortice uirgae*), Lucr. 5.1011, Moschion, fr. 6.3–6 Snell. J., however, in keeping with his purpose of debunking the primitive *matrona*, establishes his Golden Agers in a fully-fledged cave dwelling (*praeberet spelunca domos ignemque laremque* 3) – one, moreover, provided with all the discomforts of home (cf. *paruas* 2, the impression of overcrowding given by the accumulation of nouns in 3, the communal living space for animals and humans 4). Moreover, the cave is

*frigida*, although cold was not an issue either for the Golden Age people of the *Metamorphoses*, who enjoyed a time of perpetual spring and warmth (Ov. *Met.* 1.107-8, 119-20), or for Lucretius' primeval humans, who were too hardy to feel the cold (5.929, 1015-16).

**3 ignemque laremque:** termination of the hexameter in *-que...-que* is an epic device, contributing to the parodic flavour of J.'s account of primitive humankind (Urech 1999: 62-7).

**4** For the detail cf. Polyphemus' cave in Hom. *Od.* 9.182-4, Festus 40 L *antiquitus enim ante usum tectorum oues in antris claudebantur. communi...umbra* 'shared darkness' (cf. Aesch. *PV* 452-3 'they lived like little ants in the recesses of sunless caves', Sen. *Phaed.* 539 *opaca dederunt antra natiuas domos*): a debunking allusion to the belief that, in the Golden Age, everything was held in common; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 90.38 *in commune rerum natura fruebantur*, Smith on Tib. 1.3.43-4.

**5-7 siluestrem...pellibus:** J. is thinking primarily of Lucretius' account of primeval man: cf. 5.969-71 *siluestria membra | nuda dabant terrae nocturno tempore capti, | circum se foliis ac frondibus inuoluentes*; 987, 1416-18 *illa relictas | strata cubilia sunt herbis et frondibus aucta. | pellis item cecidit uestis contempta ferinae*. Given the allusion to Cynthia in 7, Propertius' description of primeval lovers is also evoked: *his tum blanditiis furtiva per antra puellae | oscula siluiculis empta dedere uiris. | hinnulei pellis stratos operibat amantes | altaque nativo creuerat herba toro* (3.13.33-6). Along with *sternere* (next n.), this Propertian intertext gives an impression of the primitive married couple as sexual beings.

**5 siluestrem montana...uxor** recalls Lucretius' primitive humans, who inhabit woods and mountains (5.955 *nemora atque cauos montes siluasque colebant*). But there may also be a scornful tone, since both adjectives are commonly used with pejorative force (= 'savage', 'uncivilised'): see *OLD* s.v. *siluestris* 4a, and for *montanus*, Liv. 9.13.7 *Samnites...ipsi montani atque agrestes*, Watson 1990: 28n. 40 and the comparable use of ῥηϊός, 'rustic, uncouth'. **sterneret:** *sterno*, like στόρνυμι, is often used of preparing a bed for lovemaking, e.g. Cic. *Clu.* 14, Mart. 3.93.24-5, 10.68.8 [*lectulus*] *quem lasciuo strauit amica uiro*.

**6 uicinarumque ferarum:** cf. Lucr. 5.982-7 (the cavemen obliged to give up their *instrata cubilia fronde* late at night to the wild animals with whom they share at close quarters their woodland habitat).

**7-11** the primitive cavewoman who breastfeeds her babies and neglects her personal appearance (*horridior*) is contrasted (*haut similis*) with the sophisticated women of modern times. In J.'s day, upper-class women generally employed wet-nurses (Bradley 1986), breast-feeding of one's own

children being singled out for special notice and associated with *pudicitia*: cf. *CIL* VI 19128 *Graxiae Alexandriae insignis exempli ac pudicitiae, quae etiam filios suos propriis uberibus educavit*; Tac. *Dial.* 28.4, Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.3. See also Beerden and Naerebout 2011.

**7–8 Cynthia, nec tibi, cuius | turbauit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos:** the two most famous mistresses of Latin love poetry, Propertius' Cynthia and Catullus' Lesbia. Using them to exemplify modern femininity, J. apostrophises (*tibi*) both as if real women, but in such a way as also to suggest their literary nature. The name Cynthia, together with *ocellos*, recalls the opening line of Propertius' first book *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*; the allusion to Lesbia is couched in language reminiscent of the famous poem (Catull. 3) on the death of her pet bird. The character of these literary mistresses, who embody beauty and sophistication along with infidelity to the poet/lover, contrasts sharply with that of the primitive woman. See further Keane 2002. **cuius | ... extinctus passer** 'the death of whose sparrow'.

**8 turbauit** 'troubled': cf. Sen. *Helv.* 5.3 *oculos tuos... sine ullo flendi fine et conturbat*, Courtney on 7–8. The conjecture of Schrader and Schurtzfleisch, *turpauit* ('disfigured'), is, however, attractive, since it would introduce an element of wit if Catullus' *turgiduli rubent ocelli* (3.18) were taken as referring primarily to Lesbia's physical, rather than emotional, disarray. For eyes spoilt by weeping cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 530, Ov. *Ars* 1.129 *quid teneros lacrimis corrumpis ocellos?* **nitidos:** cf. Catull. 2.5 *desiderio meo nitenti* (of Lesbia in the first *passer*-poem).

**9 potanda ferens infantibus ubera magnis:** a humorous distortion of the paragon who breastfeeds her own babies; see 7–11n. and nn. immediately below. **potanda:** *potare*, as opposed to the more usual *bibere* or *sugere* of suckling infants, suggests heavy drinking: cf. Isid. *Diff.* 1.74 *bibere naturae est, potare luxuriae* and *potus*, 'drunk'. **ferens... ubera:** 'the mountain-wife... has *ubera*... which are so large that she carries them to her big babes... as if these organs were external objects rather than parts of her body' (Wiesen 1989: 723). The choice of *ubera* both assimilates the cavewoman to an animal (the term is common of udders, e.g. Prop. 2.34.70, Juv. 12.8, and the passages cited below) and carries implicit criticism, since abnormally large breasts were deplored: cf. Ter. *Eun.* 313–14, Juv. 13.163, Brown on Lucr. 4.1168, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 8.8, Gerber 1978, Pausch 1996. J. also spoofs the topos whereby the abundance of the Golden Age is embodied in the flocks bringing unprompted their full udders for milking: cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.21–2, Tib. 1.3.45–6 *ultroque ferebant | obuia securis ubera lactis oues*, Hor. *Epod.* 16.49–50. Here it is the cavewoman who brings her udders for her children to milk, as it were.

**infantibus... magnis:** J. comically extends to the infants of the Golden Age the idea that men of the remote past were larger than those of the present: cf. Hom. *Il.* 12.445–9, 20.285–7, Lucr. 5.925–8 *genus humanum... fuit [primordiis mundi] | ... | ... maioribus et solidis magis ossibus intus | fundatum*, Plin. *HN* 7.73–4, Juv. 15.64–70.

**10 saepe horridior glandem ructante marito:** cf. Mart. 1.62.2 *tetrico tristior ipsa uiro*. **horridior** ‘more unkempt’. Commonly used of a squalid or rustic appearance e.g. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.13 *corpore inculto et horrido*; Ov. *Met.* 1.513–14 *non ego sum pastor, non hic armenta gregesque | horridus obseruo*. Lack of concern for personal appearance, an outward symbol of matronly *pudicitia*, was a concept that, as here, readily lent itself to ridicule: cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.8.39–40, where the *lena* unfavourably contrasts the sophisticated *puellae* of her day with the *immundae Sabinae* of old; Mart. 11.15.2 *horribiles... Sabinae* with Kay. **glandem ructante:** the gross *ructante* is at one with J.’s picture of the uncouthness of primitive man, while the phrase as a whole parodies the mythic topos of eating acorns, the food *par excellence* of early man: cf. Lucr. 5.939, Virg. *G.* 1.148, Lovejoy and Boas 1935: 95. The verb, which suggests over-indulgence (cf. Mart. 3.82.8 with W–W), also plays with the topos of Golden Age abundance (e.g. Virg. *G.* 1.127–32).

**11–13** ‘The reason is that (*OLD quippe* 1a) in those early days people lived differently, since (i.e. because they were) sprung from trees and mud, they had no parents’ (sc. to corrupt them, Courtney). J. exploits a traditional explanation of human origins (12–13 nn.) in order to account for the cave-woman’s innocence. There is an implied contrast with the common idea of corruption, usually a feature of later Ages, being handed down in a deteriorating sequence through successive generations, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.46–8 *aetas parentum peior auis tulit | nos nequiores, mox daturos | progeniem uitiosorem*.

**11 orbe nouo caeloque recenti:** cf. Lucr. 5.907 *tellure noua caeloque recenti*.

**12–13 rupto robore nati | compositiue luto:** a characteristically satirical description of the mythic origin of human beings from trees (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 4.279–81, *Anth. Pal.* 9.312.5–6 ‘for our ancestors told us that oaks were the first mothers’), or from the earth.

**12 rupto robore nati** echoes Virg. *Aen.* 8.315 *gens uirum truncis et duro robore nata* (the autochthonous Latins): by replacing *duro* with *rupto* J. conjures up an amusing image of the trees bursting open as they give birth to the humans.

**13 compositiue luto:** according to an alternative account, Prometheus fashioned the first people from clay, referred to as *limo* at Hor. *Carm.* 1.16.14; cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.82–3, West on Hes. *Theog.* 571. *lutum*, a low-register term, is chosen for its mocking and depreciatory effect (Urech 1999:



204–6): cf. Mart. 10.39, attacking a woman so old that she could be *ficta Prometheo*... *luto*, also Juv. 14.35 with Courtney. **nullos habuere parentes**: possibly inspired by Hom. *Od.* 19.163, where Penelope, enquiring after the disguised Odysseus' lineage, states 'for you were not born from oak tree or rock' i.e. 'parentless'.

**14–15 multa Pudicitiae ueteris uestigia forsā | aut aliqua**: J. amusingly corrects (Lausberg § 785) his tentative affirmation: 'perhaps there were many traces of Pudicitia even in the Silver Age – or some, at any rate'.

**14 Pudicitiae ueteris uestigia**: cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.31 *pauca tamen suberunt priscae uestigia fraudis*, in the lead-up to the return of the Golden Age, *G.* 2.473–4 *extrema per illos* [the idealised farmers] | *Iustitia excedens terris uestigia fecit*. The juxtaposition of *ueteris* and *uestigia* also recalls Virg. *Aen.* 4.23 *agnosco ueteris uestigia flammae*: ironically, this refers to a reignition of passion which Dido construes as an affront to *pudor* (27).

**15–16 et sub Ioue, sed Ioue nondum | barbato**: i.e. even (*et*) in the Silver Age, but only in its earliest stages, when Jupiter was a mere lad (the cutting of a boy's first beard marked the transition to manhood). The ousting of Saturn by his son Jupiter signalled the end of the Golden Age (Ov. *Met.* 1.113–15 quoted 1n.). For the idea of a humanised Jupiter growing from youth to adulthood, see Callim. *Hymn* 1.54–5 'fairly did you grow... heavenly Zeus, and swiftly did you grow up and speedily came the down on your cheeks'; cf. also Juv. 13.40–1.

**16–17 nondum Graecis iurare paratis | per caput alterius**: the usual form was to swear by one's own head, upon which retribution would fall if the oath were broken; cf. Virg. *Aen.* 9.300 *per caput hoc iuro* with Hardie. The Greeks avoid such retribution by diverting it to another person, *alterius* coming at the end of the phrase for a surprise effect. Greeks had a reputation for dishonesty: cf. Cic. *Flac.* 9 *testimoniorum religionem et fidem nunquam ista natio coluit*; Balsdon 1979: 31–2, 38. But the sentiment is also typical of J.'s xenophobic attitude towards them: see esp. Juv. 3.58–125 (with Braund), which is reflected in the choice of *Graecus* over the more dignified *Graius*: cf. Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 10.12.

**17–18 cum furem nemo timeret | caulibus ac pomis**: an amusingly banal image for the lack of criminality which was the hallmark of life prior to the Iron Age. J. is thinking primarily of Horace's instance of an insignificant misdeed, *Sat.* 1.3.116 *qui teneros caules alieni fregerit horti*. He may also have in mind the vegetarian diet of the Golden Age (Hes. *Op.* 117–9 with West, Ov. *Met.* 1.101–12).

**18 aperto...horto** trivialises the topos of the absence of boundaries (*aperto*) which symbolises the communality of life in the Golden Age, e.g.

Virg. *G.* 1.126–7 *ne signare quidem aut partiri limite campum | fas erat: in medium quaerebant* with Mynors. **uiueret:** a collective singular, ‘people’, must be supplied from the preceding *nemo*.

**19–20 J.** conflates Hesiod’s description (*Op.* 199–200) of Nemesis and Aidos leaving the earth together (*pariter*) with the post-Hesiodic tradition in which the two are replaced by a single goddess, the maiden Justice (Astraea), who likewise quits the earth in disgust at human wickedness (Aratus, *Phaen.* 133–4).

**19 paulatim:** cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.324–7 *aurea quae perhibent illo sub rege fuere | saecula... | deterior donec paulatim ac decolor aetas | ...successit* and the progressive withdrawal of Aratus’ Astraea (n. on *moratam* 1). **Astraea:** the name, first found in Ovid (*Met.* 1.150), is based on Aratus’ suggested genealogy for the Maiden as daughter of Astraeus, father of the stars (*Phaen.* 98–9).

**20 hac:** i.e. Pudicitia. Although she has often been identified with Hesiod’s Aidos, the correspondence is merely structural: like Aidos, Pudicitia departs with another goddess when they can no longer bear the extent of human depravity. But whereas Pudicitia has a specifically sexual reference, Aidos is a sense of shame which prevents people from engaging in unacceptable behaviour in general: see West on *Op.* 200, Gatz 1967: 50–1.

**21 anticum:** J. is using *anticus*, which properly refers to what is *spatially* anterior (Varro, *Ling.* 7.7, Festus 244 L) in the sense of *antiquus*, ‘of long standing’ (Non. 688 L, Nettleship 1889: 225), possibly as a pseudo-archaism to underscore the antiquity of the practice to which he is referring. For the combination with *uetus* cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 5–8, 13, *Mostell.* 476 *scelus, inquam, factum est iam diu, antiquom et uetus*, Cic. *Fam.* 5.20.1.

**21–2 alienum...lectum | concutere** ‘to cause another man’s bed to vibrate’: a graphic expression for ‘to commit adultery’. For beds shaking in a sexual context cf. Catull. 6.11–12, Ov. *Am.* 3.14.26 *spondaque lasciuia mobilitate tremat*, Apul. *Met.* 2.7, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.12.

**21 Postume:** introduces the addressee. See also 38n.

**22 sacri genium contemnere fulcri** ‘to show contempt for the Genius of the sacred marriage couch’, a metaphoric way of describing the adulterer’s lack of respect for the sanctity of the woman’s marriage. *fulcrum* (bed-head) probably stands *pars pro toto* for the *lectus (genialis)*, the symbolic marriage bed set up at weddings in the *atrium* in honour of (cf. *sacri*) the Genius, a guardian spirit associated with procreation (cf. *gigno*; Festus 83 L s.v. *genialis lectus*, Hersch 2010a: 214–21). A more literal interpretation of *genium fulcri* by Anderson (1889: 323–4), who identifies as a Genius the

figure which often decorates the lower part of ornate bedheads (*fulcra*), is merely an inference from the present passage.

**23–4** J. contradicts Ovid's statement (*Met.* 1.128–31) that *all* crimes began with the coming of the iron race. Although the emphasis hitherto has been on women, J. interestingly focuses here on the guilty males, *moechos*: cf. 21–2, which describe the activities of the adulterer rather than the adulteress.

**23 crimen:** after the Augustan marriage legislation of 18 BC, adultery became a crime subject to legal penalties: see Treggiari, *RM* 277–98, Gardner 1986: 127–31. **mox** 'presently'. The lapse of time implied by *mox* may be extensive (Rose 1927).

**24** J. pointedly contradicts Hesiod's account of the Silver phase, which was peopled by feckless children (*Op.* 127–35). **argentea saecula** 'the Silver Age'; *saecula* is poetic plural. Hesiod, followed by Aratus and Virgil (*Ecl.* 4.9) had talked of metallic 'races': the Romans preferred to speak of 'ages' (Baldry 1952, Gatz 1967: 205–6). J. has presumably coined *argentea saecula* on the analogy of *aurea saecula* (Virg. *Aen.* 6.792–3, 8.324–5) and *ferrea saecula* (e.g. Tib. 2.3.35).

**25–37** *Yet, Postumus, you are preparing to marry. Have you gone mad? To commit suicide would be altogether better. If you must have a bedmate, a boy is far less demanding.*

Having just established that adultery is by now an age-old practice, and a virtuous wife a figure of myth, J. affects incredulity that his addressee can, in the light of this, be contemplating marriage. How could Postumus suffer a wife who will prove dominating and demanding (a shift from the merely unfaithful)? Suicide, J. claims, is preferable to such a fate. The act, to be sure, was seen as a justifiable recourse in certain circumstances (Griffin 1986: 64–77, van Hooff 1990: 123–6), but only in the rhetoric of extreme misogamy could it be proposed as a means of avoiding marriage. The risibly hyperbolic nature of the 'advice' is one of a number of ways whereby, in this section, the seriousness of the persona is deliberately undercut. For one thing, the suggestion of self-killing pointedly invokes comic routines whereby suicide is the subject of black humour or otherwise trivialised, often as a laughably disproportionate response to a perceived misfortune: cf. Ar. *Ran.* 118–35, Petron. 94.8–15, Apul. *Met.* 1.16, Otto s.vv. *restis* and *suspendere*, Gris  1982: 108, van Hooff 1990: 71. Moreover, all the types of suicide listed are associated with the lower classes (30–2nn.); no mention is made of traditional upper-class methods – more appropriate to the addressee – like the sword, first and noblest of the three canonical methods of suicide in Antiquity (Fraenkel 1932), or opening the veins (cf. van Hooff 1990: 50–2).

As for the second proposed alternative to marriage, sleeping with a *pusio* (33–7), J. draws on another well-worn literary theme, the question of whether the love of women or boys is preferable. Examples of the long-standing debate include Plaut. *Truc.* 149–57, Lucil. 866–7 Marx *qui et poscent minus et praebebunt rectius multo | et sine flagitio*, Ov. *Ars* 2.683–4, Meleag. *Anth. Pal.* 5.208 with Gow and Page (*HE* 4046–9), Plut. *Amat.* 750b–752e, Ach. Tat. 2.35–8; Williams 2010: 22–4. But, in coming down in favour of boys (34), J., as with the suggestion of suicide, deliberately undermines his case, in this instance by presenting arguments in favour of *pueri delicati* which are easily refutable, namely that they do not make demands on their lovers in relation to gifts or to sex. For in both cases *pusiones* were frequently represented as no less rapacious than women (36–7nn.). It should be added that, in representing a wife and a *pusio* as alternatives, J. is being obtrusively disingenuous. Many husbands retained their boy-loves after marriage, thus having their sexual cake and eating it: at 272 an *uxor* complains of precisely such behaviour.

**25–6 conuentum tamen et pactum et sponsalia ... | ... paras:** i.e. you are arranging to get married. The *conuentum* was a meeting between the relevant parties where a marriage was agreed to; *pactum* refers to the formal agreement that the marriage should take place, and *sponsalia* to a legal contract of betrothal, which would include dowry arrangements: see Treggiari, *RM* 138–46. **nostra | tempestate:** poetic for *nostro tempore*. As in *Sat.* 1 (87, 149), J. imagines his own age as the culmination of a continuous deterioration of moral standards; the enjambment underscores his incredulity that Postumus is preparing to marry in this of all eras.

**26–7 a tonsore magistro | pecteris:** particular attention was paid to the coiffure on special occasions, e.g. Pers. 1.15, Juv. 11.150; for such an important event as a wedding, only a master barber (*magister*) will do. Cf. the *magister* of *ornatrices* mentioned by Marcian, *Dig.* 32.65.3.

**27 digito pignus** ‘a pledge for the finger’ i.e. an engagement ring, sent by the man to his fiancée after the formal *sponsio* as a pledge of his fidelity. See Treggiari, *RM* 148–9. **fortasse** suggests incredulity that things can have gone so far.

**28 certe sanus eras** ‘certainly you used to be sane’: for the adverb in the context of a surprising transformation, as here; cf. Juv. 9.9. The idea that no one in their right mind would marry is thoroughly hackneyed: see Alexis, fr. 264.1 K–A with Arnott; cf. also 46n.

**29 qua Tisiphone:** Tisiphone was one of the three Furies. Instead of the expected ablative of agent with *ab*, an ablative of instrument is used because *qua Tisiphone* stands by metonymy for ‘with what madness’.

**colubris:** the Furies carried whips of snakes (e.g. Sen. *HF*88) or wore them in their hair, thrusting them into a person's heart to induce madness, as in Virg. *Aen.* 7.341-405. In view of the reference to Tisiphone and the plurality of serpents, J. may have specifically in mind the insanity-provoking attack by Tisiphone on Athamas and Ino in Ov. *Met.* 4.481-511.

**30 dominam**, in combination with *ferre*, invokes the negative image of a wife who lords it over her husband. That, in marrying, a man exchanges liberty for wifely tyranny is a traditional complaint: cf. Stob. 4.519 (Hippochoos) 'joined in marriage, he is no longer free', Hierocles, *On marriage* ap. Stob. 4.506 in marrying 'they introduce over themselves a tyrant instead of a wife', Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 315a *uxor, quae in eo se aestimat dominam, si aduersus uiri faciat uoluntatem*, Watson 2008a: 282. **saluis tot restibus:** why marry 'when there are so many ropes in existence'? A corrupt passage of a Greek comic writer seems to express similar sentiments (Don. Ter. *Ad.* 43); cf. Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night* Act 1 Sc. 5.19 'many a good hanging prevents a bad marriage'. For a Roman, suicide by hanging was both unmanly and characteristic of the humble classes, as well as a method used by the desperate: see Grisé 1982: 108, van Hooff 1990: 66-71. **ullam:** as supreme misogynist, the Speaker cannot endure *any* woman. The hyperbaton with *dominam* adds emphasis to the adjective.

**31 cum pateant altae caligantesque fenestrae:** *caligare* = 'to be dizzy [from heights]' (*OLD* s.v. *caligo*<sup>2</sup> 2b, Sen. *Ep.* 57.4 *caligabit, si uastam altitudinem in crepidine eius constitutus despexerit*). The verb is transferred by personification to the high windows which cause the dizziness. Since it was the poorer residents who occupied the upper floors of high apartment blocks, self-defenestration was considered a lower-class form of suicide: cf. Grisé 1982: 117-18, van Hooff 1990: 73-6.

**32 Aemilius pons:** the oldest Roman stone bridge, spanning the Tiber from the Forum Boarium to Trastevere. Other Tiber bridges used for a suicidal leap were the Pons Fabricius (Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.36) and the Pons Sublicius (Val. Max. 4.7.3). This method was unpopular, especially with aristocrats, because the body might not be found for burial (Grisé 1982: 113-14).

**33 aut si de multis nullus placet exitus:** J. imagines Postumus weighing but then rejecting the various means of suicide, as persons contemplating the act often do: cf. Ar. *Ran.* 118-35, Luc. 9.106-8, [Sen.] *HO* 842-73, Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 25.

**34** For the view that it is better to sleep with boys see *Anth. Pal.* 12.86 and 245, Lucil. quoted 25-37n. **pusio** 'a little lad', referring to a slave-concubinus such as that of Catull. 61.124-33, Martial's Diadumenus or the

*puerulus* of Val. Max. 8.1 *damn.* 8: see further Williams 2010: 15–66 and (for visual evidence) Clarke 2003: 78–91. *pusio* is a term of popular speech, found elsewhere in highly sexualised contexts (Cic. *Cael.* 36, Apul. *Met.* 9.7.5 with Hijmans Jr. *et al.*).

**35 qui noctu non litigat:** in contrast to the nightly recriminations to be expected from a wife (268–9 with nn.).

**35–6 exigit... | nulla iacens illic munuscula:** a disingenuous argument. Boys were every bit as venal as *puellae*: cf. Mart. 11.58.1–2 *cum me uelle uides tentumque, Telesphore, sentis, | magna rogas*. The giving of costly gifts to boy-loves had been common since the sixth century BC (Koch-Harnack 1983: 161–72) and complaints against the rapacity of παιδικά are legion: cf. Ar. *Plut.* 153–9, Callim. *Ia.* 3, Tib. 1.4.57–62 esp. 58 *iam tener assuevit munera uelle puer*, Krenkel 1979: 181, 183.

**36 iacens illic:** i.e. in bed, just prior to intercourse. **munuscula:** reproduces the language which a *puella* or a wife might use to coax gifts from her lover (cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.417–36, *Am.* 1.10.11–12 with McKeown), implying that these do not amount to much, though 149–60 tell a different story. For other such wheedling diminutives, cf. Hippon. fr. 32 W/42b Degani, with Deg. *ad loc.*

**36–7 nec queritur... | ...nec quantum iussit anheles:** that boys do not make complaints about their lover's sexual performance is another specious assertion: cf. Mart. 1.46 and Petronius' tale of the Pergamene boy *Sat.* 87.8–9 *utcumque igitur inter anhelitus sudoresque tritus, quod uoluerat accepit, rursusque in somnum decidi gaudio lassus. interposita minus hora pun gere me manu coepit et dicere 'quare non facimus?' J.*'s claim sets up an implied contrast with the wifely behaviour of 475–6, as well as the more general feeling that women are sexually insatiable (cf. Watson 2008a: 275n. 43). **nec queritur quod | ...parcas...anheles:** the subjunctive is required with *quod* because the speaker is reporting, not his own words, which would call for an indicative, but those of another: see Woodcock 196, 198–9.

**37 lateri parcas:** cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.413 *sed lateri ne parce tuo* and the opposite expression *rumpere latus*, to wear oneself out by sexual exertion (Mart. 11.104.6 with Kay). *latus*, 'side', is a euphemism for the male genitalia, frequently used in reference to 'the general site of the exhaustion which might follow intercourse' (Adams, *LSV* 49). **nec quantum iussit anheles:** the imperiousness of wives (*Sat.* 6 *passim*) extends into the bedroom. *anhelare* and *anhelitus* describe panting during intercourse: cf. Petron. 87.8 quoted 36–7n., with Habermehl, Apul. *Met.* 2.17.4 *lassis animis et marcidis artubus defatigati simul ambo corruimus inter mutuos amplexus animas anhelantes*.

**38–81** *But (despite what I have just said), Ursidius has decided to marry and to have offspring – Ursidius, the serial adulterer! Worse, he is looking for a wife with old-fashioned morals. This is utter madness. Even a woman from the country (where morals were supposedly stricter) will be corrupted by the merest suggestion of urban living – assuming of course that she has not already been corrupted in her rural homeland. As for the women of Rome, you will never find a suitable wife there. Without exception, they are erotically obsessed with dancers and stage-performers. Marry such a one and you will find her becoming a mother by some musician or other, or bearing a child that is the spitting image of a gladiator.*

Writings on marriage often caution against marrying for the wrong reasons, especially wealth, physical attractiveness and noble birth (Musonius 13b; Hierocles, *On marriage* ap. Stob. 4.506; Antipater, *On living with a wife* 3.254 von Arnim and *On marriage* 3.256 von Arnim; Stob. 4.548–9). Theophrastus and Plutarch, however, extend such cautions to persons who wed purely to get children (Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 315c, Plut. *Amat.* 767d; cf. *Prae. coniug.* 142f), precisely what Ursidius is doing. Along with such warnings goes the advice that, in selecting a wife, one must have regard above all to her character (see Nicolaides 1997: 81). According to Musonius 13b, in choosing a partner one should look for ‘self-control (σωφροσύνη), justice, and virtue’: cf. Nicostratus, *On marriage* ap. Stob. 4.536–7, Antipater, *On living with a wife* 3.254 von Arnim, [Hippon.] ap. Stob. 4.546–7, Men. fr. 804 K–A, *Sent.* 296 Jaekel. Of particular relevance is the caution that it is disastrous to marry a woman who lacks a proper sense of sexual morality (Eur. fr. 661.4–5 Kannicht, Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 314c–e, Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 141c). But to marry such a one is Ursidius’ inevitable fate, according to J., who contends that it is impossible to find a chaste woman nowadays (cf. esp. 47–51). In sum, Ursidius’ decision to wed is in every way misguided.

**38 sed placet Vrsidio lex Iulia:** the ethos promoted by the *lex Iulia* (foll. n.) finds favour with Ursidius. It is disputed whether Postumus (21, 28) and Ursidius are identical. Many commentators believe so: Bellandi (2003: 99–102) raises telling objections and postulates (106, 115n. 266) a lacuna between 37 and 38 in which the connection between Postumus and Ursidius, who appears out of the blue, was signalled. Jones (2007a: 90–1) adopts the compromise position that the two are closely aligned. It appears more likely however that they are different individuals: cf. *Sat.* 8, where J., after initially addressing Ponticus, abruptly turns to a second party, Rubellius Blandus, for whom, as with Ursidius, his message has a particular relevance. The name of Ursidius, notorious adulterer turned prospective husband and father, may have ironic resonances. She-bears (*ursae*) were notoriously tender towards their offspring and even, in myth, suckled human children (Keller 1909: 176). **lex Iulia:** shorthand for the *lex Iulia de*

*maritandis ordinibus* of 18 BC and *lex Papia Poppaea* of AD 9, which encouraged marriage and procreation and penalised those who did not comply: cf. Treggiari, *RM* 60–80. This gave a legal dimension to the long-standing view, common to both Greece and Rome, that the primary purpose of marriage was the production of children (*RM* 11–13, Dixon 1992: 61–71).

**38–9 tollere...|...heredem:** a standard reason for marrying: cf. Lucil. 678–9 Marx, Dio Cass. 56.3.1–6 (the delights of raising an heir), Sor. *Gyn.* 1.34 ‘women are usually married for the sake of children and succession’, Hor. *Epist.* 1.2.44–5. Notwithstanding the conventionality of Ursidius’ motives in taking a wife, *heredem* is pointed, preparing the ground for the next remark, that by getting an heir Ursidius will forfeit the benefits that flow to the *orbi*.

**38 tollere:** according to the long-standing view, a new-born baby was placed on the ground, and by ‘lifting it up’ (*tollere*, ἀνελεῖσθαι) a Roman father acknowledged the legitimacy of the child – his future heir – and his intention of rearing it. But Köves-Zulauf 1990: 1–92 and Shaw 2001: 31–56 have convincingly questioned whether the father performed any such symbolic action, in which case *tollere liberos* means no more than ‘to rear/raise children’. **dulcem:** children are frequently so described, most famously at Lucr. 3.894–6 *iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta neque uxor | optima, nec dulces occurrent oscula nati | praeripere et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent*, where, as here, the context imparts a sardonic flavour. For the sentimental attitudes underlying the term, see Dixon 1991, Antipater, *On marriage* 3.255 von Arnim, Plut. *De amor. prol.* 495b–c, Pease on Virg. *Aen.* 4.33.

**39–40 cariturus...|...macello:** *cariturus* is concessive, ‘though you will [on that account] have to go without’: once Ursidius has an heir he must forgo the luxury foods provided by legacy hunters, *captatores* – familiar figures in the literature of the Empire – who preyed upon the childless in the hope of inducing such persons to leave all their money to them, rather than to other family members, as was customary in the absence of direct heirs: see further Champlin 1991: 101. A favourite tactic was to give their targets sumptuous foodstuffs from the market, *macellum* (here strikingly personified (cf. 5.95) as a *captator*): cf. Petron. 125.2, Mart. 12.48, Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 19.2 and, on captation in general, Tracy 1980, Hopkins 1983: 238–42, Champlin 1991: 87–102. J.’s cynicism is not without basis; cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 705–15 and the complaint of Pliny, *Ep.* 4.15.3 *saecul<um>, quo plerisque etiam singulos filios orbitatis praemia graues faciunt*.

**39 turture magno:** turtle doves were much valued as a foodstuff, especially plump specimens (Mart. 13.53, Vioque on Mart. 7.20.15).



**40 mullorum ... iubis:** a periphrasis for 'bearded red mullets', an especial delicacy (W-W 217). For their use as a lure by *captatores*, cf. Mart. 12.48.9, Juv. 5.92-8. See further D'Arcy Thompson 1947: 264-8 (265 for an illustration of the beard).

**41-2** Nothing can be thought impossible, if even a serial adulterer like Ursidius marries. An *adunaton*, 'figure from impossibility', in that formulation whereby all things hitherto unthinkable are said to be now possible, since an event believed inconceivable has taken place: cf. Archil. fr. 122.5-6 W. 'after this (an eclipse of the sun), men can believe and expect anything', Ov. Tr. 1.8.7 *omnia iam fient, fieri quae posse negabant*, Canter 1930.

**42 moechorum notissimus olim** 'one who was previously the most notorious of adulterers', particularised in 44 by reference to a scene from the 'adultery-mime', where a wife and her lover are surprised by her husband and the lover thereupon conceals himself in a chest, *cista* (Hor. Sat. 2.7.58-61, Reynolds 1946, Fantham 1989: 158): a situation in which Ursidius has frequently found himself (*totiens*). **moechorum:** 'men who commit adultery with married women' N-H on Hor. Carm. 1.25.9.

**43-4** 43 should with Prinz (details in Courtney) be transposed to follow 44, as this yields a far more powerful conclusion to 42-4.

**44 perituri** 'about to be done for' (*OLD* s.v. 5), rather than 'about to perish', if discovered. It is by no means clear that a husband had the legal right to kill an adulterer whom he caught *in flagranti delicto* with his wife (Treggiari, *RM* 268-75). *perire* refers rather to punishments, short of death, inflicted on the lover by the aggrieved husband: cf. Hor. Sat. 1.2.132-3 *discincta tunica fugiendum est et pede nudo*, | *ne nummi pereant aut puga*, Ov. Ars 3.607 *perimus* (both scenes from the adultery mime). For such impromptu sanctions, which could be extremely violent, cf. Val. Max. 6.1.13, Hor. Sat. 1.2.41-6, Adams 1983b: 313. **Latini:** the rôle of the lover in the adultery mime (42n.) became identified with the famous Domitianic *archimimus* Latinus: cf. Mart. 1.4.5 with Howell.

**43 stulta** reflects the dialectic of misogamy, which condemns marriage, for whatever reason, as 'folly': cf. Eur. *El.* 1097-8, Anaxandr. fr. 53.1-2 K-A 'whoever decides to marry, decides wrongly', Men. fr. 298.1-2 K-A, Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. Adv. Iovinian. 315c *liberorum causa uxorem ducere... stolidissimum est*. Further, *stulta ora*, in conjunction with *capistro*, evokes the fable of the horse which, for a short-term gain, submits to the halter and thereby sacrifices its freedom: cf. 'Aesop' *Fab.* 238 Hausrath-Hunger, Phaedr. 4.4, Babr. 166.6, who speaks of 'the stupid horse'. In

the same way, Ursidius, by marrying, is exchanging freedom for domestic tyranny (*dominam* 30n.). Finally, by applying to Ursidius the epithet of the husband in the adultery mime, who was known as the *stultus* (Cic. *De or.* 2.251) or *stupidus* (Juv. 8.197), J. implies that Ursidius will soon be transformed from *moechus* to cuckolded *maritus*. **maritali...capistro:** a striking metaphor drawn from Virgil (*ora capistris* G. 3.188–9, 398–9) to express the loss of male autonomy entailed by marriage. The *capistrum* proper is a sort of head harness by which an animal can be controlled with a rope: cf. Virg. G. 3.188–9 (used to train a colt), White 1975: 94–6. Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 139b and *Amat.* 752d similarly uses the image of the χαλινός to characterise the restraints imposed by marriage, but with reference to the wife: cf. Pomeroy 1999: 47–8.

**45–6** *quid quod* introduces an argument which reaffirms in stronger terms a preceding assertion (K–S 2.277, 499): it's bad enough that Ursidius wants to marry (38–9), but, to compound things, he is looking for a wife of exemplary *pudicitia*, although he of all people should know better.

**45 antiquis...de moribus:** used in place of a genitive of quality (e.g. Liv. 39.11.5 *probam et antiqui moris feminam*, Tac. *Hist.* 2.64.2). It may be regarded as a bold extension of *de* + abl. to characterise the material of which something is composed, e.g. Varro, *Ling.* 5.116 *loris de corio crudo*, Plin. *HN* 26.23 *sucus de quinquefolio*, K–S 1.499. Duff and Courtney treat the construction as partitive: for this use of *de* see Löfstedt 1936a: 106–9.

**46 nimiam pertundite uenam** 'lance his swollen vein'. Bloodletting (*sanguinem incisa uena mitti* Celsus, *Med.* 2.10.1), on the grounds that the patient had an excess of blood (πληθός, Brain 1986: 11, 78), was a treatment for various diseases (Celsus, *Med.* 2.6–11), including, as here, madness. Cf. Suet. *Calig.* 29.2 *necessariam esse sanguinis missionem, cui tam diu non prodesset elleborum* (another cure for madness), Petron. 90.4 with Habermehl.

**47 delicias hominis!** 'the preciousness of the fellow!' Accusative of exclamation, used in contexts of strong emotion (Hofmann 1978: §53), here astonishment and disapprobation. For *deliciae* of affected behaviour see Fordyce on Catull. 50.3.

**47–8 Tarpeium...| pronus:** in a gesture of obeisance (*adorare*), Roman worshippers prostrated themselves (*pronus*) upon the steps or the threshold of a temple, which they kissed: cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.375–6 *ut templi tetigere gradus, procumbit uterque* | *pronus humi, gelidoque pauens dedit oscula saxo*, Tib. 1.2.83–4, Appel 1909: 199, 202. *Tarpeium limen* refers to the temple on the Capitol, closely identified with the Tarpeian rock, containing three shrines to Jupiter, Juno (48–9n.) and Minerva. The epithet *Tarpeium* is standard

in this connection (e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 6.34 *iunctaque Tarpeio sunt mea* [sc. *Iunonis*] *templa Ioui*, Prop. 4.1.7), but here also calls attention to the notorious unchastity and unrealisable marital ambitions of Tarpeia (cf. Prop. 4.4), who gave her name to the rock.

**48–9** A thank-offering to Juno, as goddess of marriage, for granting the addressee's wish to acquire a wife who is *pudica*. At Virg. *Aen.* 4.59–61, in an attempt to win divine sanction for a union with Aeneas, Dido sacrifices a *uacca* to Juno, *cui uincla iugalia curae*. In offering bulls or heifers to deities it was usual to gild the horns (with *auratam* an accusative of respect, *cornua*, must be understood): cf. Plin. *HN* 33.39, Virg. *Aen.* 9.627, Latte 1960: 386. The sex of the victim corresponds, as normal, to that of the divine honorand (Latte 1960: 380–1).

**49** *si tibi contigerit* suggests that such an event would be entirely serendipitous and hence unlikely. *capitis* is used by a familiar synecdoche for 'personage', 'the head [being] in some sense the person' (Onians 1951: 98), but as part of the clause *si tibi contigerit capitis matrona pudici* also takes on a far more unsavoury connotation, the *os impurum* (51n.). For *caput* standing for *os* in such a context see Adams, *LSV* 212 n. 1; for the word used of both a personage and oral sexuality, Mart. 6.26 with W–W 247–8. **matrona**: of Ursidius' bride-to-be: cf. *socer*, 'future father-in law' (Virg. *Aen.* 11.440), *mariti*, 'possible husbands' (*Aen.* 4.35) and *νυμφίος*, 'prospective bridegroom' (*Anth. Pal.* 7.490.2). Since *pudicitia* is the primary matronal virtue (Langlands 2006: 37–77), the appearance of *matrona* in a context of sensational *impudicitia* is deeply ironic.

**50** The general sense is clear, the details less so. Ceres was noted for chastity (Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.11, Spaeth 1996:115–16, 121–3), so for a woman who was *impudica* to touch her *uittae* would constitute pollution. The natural sense of *Cereris uittae* is that these belonged to a statue of the goddess (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.168, touching the *uittae* of the Palladium), but it is for *uittae* worn by her votaries that we have evidence (Tert. *De test. an.* 2.7, *De pall.* 4.10). Le Bonniec (1958: 420) thinks J. is referring to the latter; Spaeth (1996: 115–16) says the phrase could refer to either. To avoid these difficulties Giangrande 1965: 26–8 suggested *Cereris uictus*, the food being polluted by the women's impure touch (cf. O4–5). **adeo** introduces an explanation of 47–9, 'so true is it that' (*OLD* s.v. *adeo*<sup>2</sup> 5).

**51** **quarum... oscula**: a reference to the *ius osculi*, the custom whereby relatives of a woman greeted her with a kiss on the mouth (cf. Moreau 1978: 94–6). Such kisses, bestowed on a father by a daughter with an *os impurum*, a mouth which engages in oral sexuality, become a thing to be feared. The fear is both of pollution and the evil smell which supposedly issued from the mouths of *fellatrices* (Catull. 99.9–10, Mart. 1.94, Krenkel 2006:

213–14). Oral sex was regarded with revulsion in Greek and Roman society (Obermayer 1998: 214–31).

**51–2 necte...|...corymbos:** a sarcastic exhortation to go ahead and do what the speaker regards as disadvantageous (cf. imperatives introduced by *i nunc*). As in Greece (Plut. *Amat.* 755a, Hierocles, *On marriage* ap. Stob. 4.506), Romans adorned the doorposts and threshold of a bridegroom with garlands and foliage on the occasion of his marriage: cf. 79, 228, Luc. 2.354–5 (*limen* and *postes*), Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.231, Blümner 1911: 353–4. The object was public advertisement of a joyous occasion (Juv. 9.85, Sen. *Ep.* 67.11, Tac. *Ann.* 15.71.1, Blech 1982: 275–6), but the *ramorum uiridium uis salutifera* may also have had an apotropaic purpose (Köchling 1914: 65): cf. 79n.

**52 corymbos:** we hear of olive, laurel and myrtle used as festal foliage at weddings (Plut. *Amat.* 755a, Juv. 6.79, Claud. *Epithal.* 208, *Etym. magn.* s.v. κορυθάλη), but the mention of *corymbi*, ivy clusters, is apparently unique in this context, albeit the plant is often used as a decoration (*RE* v 2835 s.v. *Epheu*). Dionysus, with whom ivy is closely associated, has, however, some connections with marriage (Virg. *Aen.* 4.58 with Pease). It is also relevant that, in art, Erotes wear or carry garlands of ivy (*RE* v 2843, 2845, 2846). Finally, the sheer luxuriance of the plant makes it appropriate to a wedding, given the intimate connection of the latter with fertility.

**53 unus...uir sufficit?** for the unlikeliness of such a scenario, cf. Sen. *Ben.* 3.16.3 *quam inuenies tam miseram, tam sordidam, ut illi satis sit unum adulterorum par?* Formulations such as *uno contenta marito* and *uniuiria* are commonplace in epitaphs for wives, reflecting the traditional conjugal ideal of *uniuiratus*, being married to one husband (intro. 23). J. echoes the terminology but applies it to a thoroughly sordid context.

**53–4 ocius...|...oculo contenta sit uno:** *extorquebis* is used in the transferred sense of ‘extort’ (*OLD* s.v. 2), but mention of ocular deprivation and threats of eye-gouging in Roman comedy, as well as Mart. 3.92, a source-text for the present couplet, additionally suggest a play on the literal sense ‘remove with a twist’: cf. Audollent 1904, no. 222B.1–2 *huic gallo...lingua* (sic) *uiuo extorsi*, Petron. 48.7 *illi Cyclops pollicem...extorsit*. That Hiberina would be content to lose an eye rather than amend her ways illustrates the extent of her nymphomania: to be *lusca*, one-eyed, was disfiguring in the extreme (Mart. 12.22, Tac. *Hist.* 4.62.2, Watson 1982), and eyes are proverbial for one’s most precious possession: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.35–6, Catull. 3.5 with Fordyce.

**55–7 ‘magna...|...|...paterno:** an imagined objection from Ursidius, ‘they say that a chaste woman can still be found in the countryside’,

which J. proceeds to demolish (the rhetorical figure *occupatio*). Country women were known for chastity and preservation of traditional marital ideals (Virg. *G.* 2.523–4, Liv. 42.34.2–3, Watson 2003: 108–9): Nicostratus, *On marriage* specifically recommends taking to wife ‘a little woman brought up in the country’ (Stob. 4.536). *rure paterno uiuentis* and *agello paterno* conjure up the time-honoured picture of the smallholder and family working his inherited farm (Hor. *Epod.* 2.1–3 *beatus ille, qui...|...| paterna rura...exerces*), with all its connotations of old-fashioned moral probity. But this was a largely vanished ideal (Watson 2003: 83–4): writers of the Empire adduce it largely as an example of the good old days, e.g. Mart. 6.64.1–3, Juv. 14.161–72.

**56–7 uiuat...|...paterno:** J.’s cynical response: let her succeed in living as chastely in the most deserted of towns as she did on her *agellus paternus*, and I’ll allow that you were right about the salutary influence upon her morals of rural life. Fidenae and Gabii were old Latin townships which had become a byword for desolation (Hor. *Epist.* 1.11.7–8 *Gabiis desertior atque | Fidenis*, Mayor on Juv. 10.100), though in fact neither was particularly depopulated in the first century and a half of the Empire (Tac. *Ann.* 4.62–3, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.53.1, Ashby 1902: 188–9). J.’s implication that even in Gabii a chaste woman can be corrupted differs radically from his picture at 3.192, *simplicibus Gabiis*.

**57 agello cedo paterno:** if the text is correct, this must mean ‘I concede to you i.e. allow that you were correct in regard to the *agellus paternus*’ (abl. of respect: cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.23 *non tu quidem tota re, sed... temporibus errasti*; K–S 1.392). But the compression is harsh and the problem cannot be solved by explaining *agello* as dative, since ‘I yield to the paternal *agellus*’ cannot be distorted to mean ‘I grant what you say of the influence of the paternal country seat.’ Several commentators translate ‘I withdraw from my paternal estate’, a figurative way of saying ‘I am ready to pay a high price if my wager that she will prove corruptible turns out to be wrong.’ This fails on the grounds that the *agellus* of 57 cannot be J.’s, but must be identical with the *rus* of 55 and the *ager* of 56. Thierfelder’s *credo* (1941: 317–18) is intolerably jejune. With some hesitation we retain *cedo*.

**58–9 quis...montibus...| speluncis?** ‘But who says that nobody ever did it in the mountains or caves?’ i.e. she could easily have lost her innocence there (for euphemistic *agere*, see Adams, *LSV* 205). *montibus* and *speluncis*, picking up *rure paterno* 55 and contrasted with the tenuously urban setting of 56–7, stand for mountainous countryside: *montes*, like ὄρος (cf. Philet. fr. 10.1 Pow.) is often a virtual synonym for ‘the country’. At the same time, the specific recall of *spelunca* 3 and *montana* 5 undercuts the picture of

primitive sylvan *pudicitia* developed there. Mountains and caves, J. hints, were never entirely a locus of sexual continence.

**59 adeo senuerunt?** A rhetorical question: have Mars and Jupiter, gods who freely availed themselves of the mythical-rural landscape to seduce or rape, become such sexual geriatrics as to abandon their licentious ways (for *senectus* as a metaphor for sexual senescence cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.7.17–18, Petron. 132.10, Philodemus, 19.5–6 Sider)? Cf. Sen. fr. 119 Haase *quid ergo est quare apud poetas salacissimus Iuppiter desierit liberos tollere? utrum sexagenarius factus est et illi lex Papia fibulam imposuit?*

**60–2** After dismissing the likelihood of acquiring a suitable wife in the country, J. now rules out, in a further rhetorical question, the possibility of finding any such in the colonnades and theatres (*spectacula*) of the city. The suggestion that a Roman man would go looking for a spouse in these locations is designedly ludicrous: not only were upper-class marriages normally arranged in-house (Treggiari, *RM* 125–45), but colonnades and theatres are specifically recommended by Ovid, *Ars* 1.67–74 and 89–100, the key intertext for 60–2, as venues for picking up libertine ladies – hardly suitable wife material.

**60 porticibusne:** the plural advertises J.'s debt to Ov. *Ars* 1.67–74, where Ovid canvasses four porticos as venues for courting *puellae*: other references in elegy and elsewhere to colonnades as places to seek out a girlfriend typically mention only one (Watson 2007a: 631). **femina:** an honorific term for a woman, with connotations of probity and respectability (Adams 1972: 234–8, Santoro L'Hoir 1992: 29–40), ironised by the context.

**60–1 uoto | digna tuo:** *uoto* is an ironic echo of Ov. *Ars* 1.89–90 *sed tu praecipue curvis uenare theatri* [J.'s *spectacula*] | *haec loca sunt uoto fertiliora tuo*. This once more puts the would-be bridegroom in the rôle of an elegiac lover on the lookout for a mistress, further underscoring the unlikelihood of his turning up a chaste bride. *digna* reflects the language of matrimony: *digna condicio* is 'a suitable match'; cf. *ILS* 8393 col. 2.34–5, Plaut. *Trin.* 159, Treggiari, *RM* ch. 3.

**61 cuneis:** the wedge-shaped blocks into which the seating was divided in the theatre. **totis:** equivalent to *omnibus* (cf. 8.255), a usage found primarily in Latin of the Empire (Löfstedt 1936b: 209–11).

**62 quod securus ames quodque inde excerpere possis?** 'an object for you to love, that you could pick out from there without anxiety': ironically adapts to a marital context Ovid's advice for courting *demi-mondaines*, *Ars* 1.91–2 *illic* [sc. in the theatre] *inuenies quod ames, quod ludere possis, | quodque*

*semel tangas, quodque tenere uelis*. The use of *quod* to designate the love-object, often accompanied by some form of *amare*, is a favourite idiom of Ovid (McKeown on *Am.* 2.2.14), further underscoring the Ovidian provenance of 60–2. To exploit these resonances J. promotes *quod ames* to the beginning of the clause, resulting in a slight *hysteron-proteron*.

**63–4** First of several examples of women's passion for stage-performers: they go into ecstasies of sexual arousal when watching pantomime dancers. Pantomime was famously sensual. Martial characterises the celebrated pantomimist Paris as *urbis deliciae... lusus et uoluptas* (11.13.3–4), graffiti style practitioners *caloi*, 'beautiful' (Franklin 1987: 99), 'Cupido' is, tellingly, the name of a pantomime-artist on a medallion from Lyon (Jory 1996: 10 and fig. 5), an enthusiast for the art in Lucian's *De saltatione* describes himself as watching ἐρωτικῶς (85). The pantomime's sensuousness stemmed from the erotic nature of the plots (Lucian 2, 59 'above all else ... the stories of their [mythological characters'] loves, including the loves of Zeus himself', Min. Fel. *Oct.* 37.12), the provocative sinuousness of the dancers' movements (Ov. *Ars* 3.351–2 *artifices lateris, scaenae spectacula, amantur*;*| tantum mobilitas illa decoris habet*) and the epicene nature of the dancers, whose sexual ambiguousness gave them a powerful erotic charge: cf. Lada-Richards 2007: 71–4, *infra* 63n.

**63 chironomon:** used adjectivally to mean 'pantomimic'. So integral to the pantomime was *cheironomia*, graceful and rhythmic movement of hands and arms (Lucian, *Salt.* 78, Dickie 1993: 114–18) that *cheironomos* becomes a synonym for *pantomimus* (cf. Juv. 5.121 *saltantem... et chironomunta*, Aristaenet. *Ep.* 1.26.16–17 Mazal, Hesych. χειρονόμος: ὀρχηστής, Şahin 1975: 294, 296). As usual when J. uses a Greek technical term, there is an implication of an undesirable Hellenistic importation: cf. 3.67–78, Lada-Richards 2007: 64–6 for Roman ambivalence towards the pantomime and dancing more generally. The effect is underlined by retention of the Greek accusative form in *-on*. **Ledam... saltante Bathyllo:** the pantomime drew heavily for its plots on mythological themes, including the loves of Zeus (63–4n.). For Leda in particular, cf. Fronto 154 Van Den Hout, Arn. *Adv. nat.* 7.33, Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 23.286. Dancers were usually male, but routinely portrayed females (Lucian, *Salt.* 2, 28, Lada-Richards 2007: index 238–9 s.vv. 'pantomime parts'). *saltare* with a proper noun in the accusative means 'to dance a rôle' (Jory 1981: 147n. 4, K–S 1.278). **mollis:** pantomimes are regularly stigmatised as 'soft' or 'effeminate' (*mollis*: see Lada-Richards 2007: 69, Lucian, *Salt.* 2 'a womanish man', Weinreich 1944/48: 175), partly due to their playing transgendered rôles ('if necessary ... becoming exceedingly womanish' Lucian 82, prev. n.), partly because of the feminised and voluptuous movement of the dancer's limbs (Columella, *Rust.* 1 *praef.* 15, *Anth. Lat.* 100. 1–2 SB with Kay, Lucian

71 dance ‘makes the body soft, supple and light and teaches it to be adroit in shifting’). **Bathyllo:** along with Pylades, Bathyllus was responsible for the introduction of pantomime to Rome in 23 BC (or, according to Jory 1981, brought about a surge in the popularity of an already established form): see Weinreich 1944/48: 45–53 for his career. The Bathyllus of this passage is either a *pantomimus* who adopted the name of his famous predecessor (stage names were passed down from generation to generation, 112–13n.) or, since we have no evidence of a second Bathyllus, J. may be using the name as a generic term for a *pantomimus*.

**64 Tuccia uesicae non imperat:** Tuccia becomes so aroused that she loses control of her bladder, an extreme instance of the phenomenon reported by Lucian, *Salt.* 81 ‘nor can people contain themselves from pleasure’. Adams, *LSV* 92 sees the expression as a coarse way of saying that Tuccia is moist with desire (cf. *Anth. Lat.* 487a.19–20 Riese for a possibly similar female reaction to a *mimus*), but this grossly understates the matter. At all events, the unusual name puts us in mind of the homonymous Vestal who carried water in a sieve from the river Tiber to the Forum. By not spilling any water, Tuccia proved her innocence on a charge of *incestum* (Wildfang 2006: 85–6); by making water, her namesake establishes her *impudicitia*. **Apula:** as with Tuccia, the name is ironically suggestive of chastity; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 2.39–42. **gannit:** she ‘yelps’ like a dog in her excitement (*gannire cum sit proprie canum* Non. 722 L.): cf. the *gannitus* of the rich *matrona* during foreplay with the asinine Lucius Apul. *Met.* 10.22. The point depends partly on the notorious sexual shamelessness of dogs (Brown on Lucr. 4.1203, *RE* VIII 2568–9).

**65 sicut in amplexu** is irredeemably banal and little sense can be made of *miserabile*. Further difficulties are noted by Martyn 1976 and Courtney. The line should be excised as an interpolation.

**66 attendit Thymele** ‘Thymele is all attention’ (Braund). Even Thymele, a mime actress (8.197; her name = ‘stage’) and therefore *au fait* with ways to titillate spectators (Howell on Mart. 1 *praef.* 15), recognises that she can refine these skills by watching Bathyllus. **tunc rustica** ‘*ingénue* as she is at that moment’ (when learning from the masterly performance), scarcely a reference to the country girl of 55–7. *rustica* connotes a lack of sophistication in matters of love and sex (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.8.3 *et mihi iucundo non rustica cognita furto*, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.8.44): Thymele is oxymoronically (prev. n.) a neophyte by comparison with Bathyllus.

**67–70** In the closed season for the theatre, other female fans are reduced to fondling morosely items of the actors’ costumes. *histriones* exercised a powerful attraction for Roman *matronae* (*IG* XIV 1683.5), not least those



of the upper classes (Mart. 6.6, Petron. 126.6): a number of them supposedly engaged in scandalous affairs with actors (Leppin 1992: 116–20). The lines look to be a sardonic echo of Virg. *Aen.* 4.82–3 *sola domo maeret uacua stratisque relictis* [*sc. ab Aenea*] | *incubat*.

**67** *aulaea* ‘stage curtains’.

**68** Only the noise of the courts (*fora*) is to be heard in the off-season for the theatre, which normally resounded with the applause of the spectators (Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.16, Lucian, *Salt.* 83), not to mention the musical and vocal accompaniment (Lucian 72). Conversely at the Megalesia *scaena sonat, ludique uocant. spectate Quirites, | et fora Marte suo litigiosa uacent* (Ov. *Fast.* 4.187–8).

**69** *atque...longe Megalesia*: at their height, the *ludi Plebei* ran from 4 to 17 November, of which the first nine days were given over to scenic performances (Scullard 1981: 196–7). The *Megale(n)sia*, instituted in 191 BC in honour of the *Magna Mater* Cybele, had from the start a prominent theatrical element; they extended in imperial times from 4 to 10 April (Bernstein 1998: 186–206, esp. 201 n. 478).

**70** *thyrsus*que: a wand tipped with a pine cone and wreathed with ivy, sacred to Dionysus. See also Acci n. **subligar**: a loincloth (Olson 2003: 206–8) worn by actors to hide their private parts (Cic. *Off.* 1.129). There is thus a clear sexual innuendo: cf. Mart. 3.87 with W–W. **Acci**: *Acci* or *Acti*? The former is read (in one form or another) by most MSS and is backed by quotations in *GLK*; the latter has some limited MS support (*actii* T). Since J. appears at this point to have moved on to stage genres other than pantomime, and Accius is the name of a famous Republican composer of tragedies, it is most natural to suppose that, in mentioning *thyrsus*, *persona* (stage mask) and *subligar*, J. is alluding to a tragic actor, Accius, who had played the rôle of Dionysus or a follower of the god. If, however, we read *Acti*, J. must be referring to a famous pantomimist of that name known from Pompeian graffiti and elsewhere (Franklin 1987). Masks were equally used in the pantomime (Lucian, *Salt.* 29, 66), pantomime enacted Dionysiac themes (cf. *Anth. Plan.* 289) and, since *pantomimi* wore diaphanous clothing (Lada-Richards 2007: 210 n. 46) and frequently portrayed females, assumption of the *subligar* was surely necessary to conceal their sex.

**71–2** *Atellans*, named after the Oscan-speaking Campanian town of Atella, were a type of native farce, originally improvised, until they attained literary form in the Sullan period. Mummius breathed new life into the genre in the first century AD, and they remained popular thereafter (Brill’s *NP* s.vv. *Atellana fabula*). *Atellans* were characterised by crudity of various

types (Diomedes ap. *GLK* 1.489–90, Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.46–7, Tert. *De spect.* 17). There was a large element of mythological burlesque, to judge from Suet. *Dom.* 10 and surviving titles such as *Ariadne*, *Atalanta*, *Andromache*, *Sisyphus*. The Autonoe of 72 was the mother of Actaeon and sister of Agave and Ino.

**71 *Vrbicus*:** quite a common name (Kajanto 1965: 311). Courtney notes a *scaenicus* called Aelius Urbicus, which, along with the present passage, suggests that it became a stage-name. ***exodio ... Atellanae*** ‘an after-piece consisting of an Atellan’ (for the so-called ‘defining genitive’, see K–S 1.418–20); *exodia* were pieces which came after a play (Schol. Juv. 3.175), much in the manner of Greek satyr-dramas. Skutsch, *RE* vi 1687–8 renders ‘the after-piece of an Atellan’ – grammatically easier, but not taking account of the fact that sources make little, if any, distinction between Atellans and *exodia*: one of Novius’ Atellans was titled *Exodium*, while Suet. *Tib.* 45 uses the phrase *in Atellanico exodio*; cf. also Oakley on Liv. 7.2.12. Pichon 1913: 257 suggests taking *Atellanae* as an adjective and joining it with *Autonoes* to yield the sense ‘an Autonoe from Atella’, but ‘an Autonoe in an Atellan’ (i.e. spoofing the rôle of a tragic Autonoe in an Atellan farce) is surely more plausible.

**72 *hunc ... pauper*:** as a much more unsophisticated form (Beare 1964: 137–48) than the high-status types of performance mentioned in 73–4, the stars of which exercised a scandalous erotic appeal over persons of the highest social classes (Leppin 1992: 116–20, 272–5), the Atellans could be expected to attract groupies from lower echelons of society. Lower-class females, J. implies, are just as besotted with actors as their upper-class counterparts, the primary focus of 63–81.

**73–4 *soluitur ... | ... cantare uetent*:** both clauses refer to infibulation, the insertion of a ring (κρίκος) through the foreskin of the penis, in order to make intercourse impossible. Celsus, *Med.* 7.25.3 and Oribas. 50.11 describe the operation in detail: illustrations in Stieda 1902: 247–8. Both *comoedi* and citharodes were subject to the procedure (Mart 7.82.1–2, 14.215, *Priap.* 77.13–17, Juv. 6.378–9). The rationale was the belief – disputed solely by Pliny, *HN* 28.58 – that coitus was harmful to the voice (Ar. *Hist. an.* 581a17–27, Gal. 8.451 Kühn, Celsus, *Med.* 7.25.3, Schol. Juv. 6.379 *fibulam dicit circellos, quos tragoedi siue comoedi in penem habent, ut coitum non faciant, ne uocem perdant*). See further Stieda 1902: 244–58 and Dingwall 1925:1–66.

**73 *soluitur ... magno ... fibula*:** attachment of the ring was intended to be more or less permanent (Jüthner *RE* ix 2.2544 s.v. *infibulatio*); Martial 9.27.12 states that a *faber* was required to undo the procedure. This, allied

to the fact of the infibulation itself, which notionally made the artists sexually off-limits, had the effect of increasing their attractiveness to women fans, who would pay a high price (*magno*) for the privilege of having sex with them: cf. Mart. 14.215 *dic mihi simpliciter, comoedis et citharoedis, | fibula, quid praestas? 'carius ut futuant'*.

**74 Chrysogonum cantare uetent:** a citharode (cf. Juv. 7.176), who sang lyrics in both Greek and Latin, accompanying himself on the *cithara* (Quint. *Inst.* 1.12.3). Preserving his voice by abstaining from intercourse would be crucially important for him, but the unnamed female admirers (*sunt quae*) are more interested in his sexual prowess than maintainance of his vocal powers. **Hispulla:** several women bearing this name (associated with the Transpadane region, Syme 1949:15) appear in the Younger Pliny's circle, which would suggest upper-class associations.

**75 an expectas ut Quintilianus ametur?** 'You don't seriously expect them to fall in love with a Quintilian?' Quintilian, the noted first-century AD teacher of oratory, stands for the type of the ageing, morally earnest, dry-as-dust intellectual (Mart. 2.90, Winterbottom 1998), who is hardly likely to appeal to J.'s libertine ladies. *expectare ut* suggests ironically a contingency that will never eventuate: cf. 239, 11.25-6, Plaut. *Trin.* 734-5 *parata dos domist: nisi expectare uis | ut eam sine dote frater nuptum conlocet*, Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 82.

**76-7** The prognosticated situation resembles Mart. 6.39, where Cinna's wife produces seven bastards, each by a different one of his household slaves. Here Echion and co. are independent operators, but the professions of *citharoedus* and *choraules* were disreputable (Mayor on Juv. 8.198), so that the blood introduced into the household is not just extraneous, but debased.

**76 citharoedus Echion:** a name with indubitably low-class associations: Echion occurs several times in *CIL* VI as a servile name and is also the name of Petronius' unpleasant freedman *centonarius* (45.2). For *citharoedus* see 74n. The wife of the emperor Pertinax was supposedly in love with one (SHA *Pert.* 13.8).

**77 Glaphyrus:** cf. Mart. 4.5.8 *plaudere nec Cano* [a flautist], *plaudere nec Glaphyro*. There was a notable piper of this name in the Augustan period (cf. *ILS* 5232, an epitaph for the wife of *Titus Claudius Glaphyrus choraules*; Antipater of Thessalonica, *Anth. Pal.* 9.517 (93-8 GP) and 9.266 (681-6 GP). As with *Bathyllo* 63, J.'s Glaphyrus is either a contemporary exponent of the art who took his stage-name from his predecessor, or else the name of the Augustan artist is used as a generic term for a *choraules*. In any event, the name is meaningful. γλαφυρός, 'neat, elegant', is used of

musical virtuosity: cf. Lucian, *Dial. d.* 7.4, *Anth. Pal.* 9.517.2–3 Γλάφυρε, | οὔνομα καὶ τέχνης καὶ σώματος which Gow and Page *GP* explain as ‘elegant both in his person and in his art’; but, in this highly sexualised context, γλαφυρός, related as it is to *glaber*, ‘smooth-skinned’, calls to mind the seemingly effeminate male who is nonetheless decidedly virile in a heterosexual relationship (cf. O20–6 with nn.). **choraules**: a wind-player who accompanied singers at public functions or private parties.

**78–81** ‘That’s right, go ahead and celebrate your marriage, with its expectation of an heir (38–9), and in a highly public manner – all so that your wife can give birth to a bastard, a mini-replica of a *murmillio*.’

**78 longa...pulpita**: *pulpita* are seats erected for watching dramatic performances, here temporary structures from which persons could watch the *deductio* (escorting) of the bride from her natal home to her marital household. The *deductio* was a very public affair (Phaedr. 1.6.1 *uicinis... celebres... nuptias*, Treggiari, *RM* 166–7) and the presence of a large number of witnesses and spectators crucial to the validation of the marriage as a legitimate union (Caldwell 2008: 431–3). *longa* suggests both the expectation of a great crowd of spectators (as at Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.229–37) and practical necessity: narrow streets could not accommodate benches many rows deep. **angustos...uicos**: Rome’s streets (*OLD uicus* 2) were narrow (Juv. 3.236–7 *arto | uicorum in flexu*, André 1950: 120), despite attempts by Nero following the great fire to improve matters (Courtney on Juv. 3 *ibid.*) and by Domitian to stop commercial premises encroaching on the already limited space (Mart. 7.61).

**79** See 51–2n. The doors of the bridegroom’s home were decked with laurel on account of its supposed capacity to avert evil (Ogle 1910: 293–4), an idea ironised by the immediately following lines. For *grandi* cf. Juv. 12.91 *longos erexit ianua ramos* (another joyous occasion).

**80–1** exhibit a consciously elevated style (the poetic *testudineus*, the apostrophe *tibi*, *Lentule*, the spondaic ending of 80, the epic name Euryalus, the metaphoric *exprimat*) which mimics the noble status of Lentulus (cf. Juv. 8.187), drastically undercut by the shock juxtaposition of *Euryalum murmillonem*.

**80 testudineo...conopeo**: a baby’s cradle inset with tortoise shell. Couches and beds inlaid with this were a sign of wealth and luxury (Juv. 11.94–5, Varro, *Sat. Men.* 448 Astbury *quam in testudineo lecto culcita plumea in die dormire*, Plin. *HN* 9.39, Richter 1966: 106). *conopeum*, properly ‘a mosquito net’ (Gk. κώνωψ), seemingly acquired by extension the meaning ‘canopied bed’, assuming this to be the sense at Varro, *Rust.* 2.10.8 *fetas nostras, quae in conopiis iacent dies aliquot*. The present usage is apparently

an extension of this. *conopea* are inextricably linked with the idea of *luxuria* (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.12 and 9.16). An aristocrat such as Lentulus could afford to indulge a taste for such fittings.

**81** In flagrant violation of the ethic that the resemblance of her offspring to her husband is proof of her chastity ('Phintys the Pythagorean' Stob. 4.591, Mart. 6.27.3–4 with Grewing), Lentulus' wife will produce a child that is the image of her gladiator-lover. **Euryalum murmillonem:** the *murmillo* was one of the heavyweight categories of gladiator: see K–E 48–51. The original Euryalus was a beautiful Trojan youth (Virg. *Aen.* 5.295). The epic allusion is deliberately jarring in this sordid context, but also suggests the allure which Euryalus exercised over the adulterous *uxor*. See also 110n. **exprimat:** a metaphor based on the idea of 'expressing' or 'representing' in an artistic medium (Brink on Hor. *Ars P.* 33). *nobilis Euryalum murmillonem exprimat* points oxymoronically to the abhorrence felt by the Romans for unions between upper-class females and slaves or freedmen (Evans-Grubb 1993).

**82–113** *Eppia, wife of a senator, eloped to Egypt with a gladiator, abandoning husband, family and home and, more astonishing still, the games. Though reared in the lap of luxury, she made light of the hardships of the sea voyage. When behaving scandalously, women shed their natural timorousness, sea-sickness is forgotten and they make themselves quite at home on board. But what was it that made Sergius so madly attractive to Eppia? Certainly not his looks. It was his profession of gladiator: if he retired, he would lose all his charms.*

It has been fashionable in recent years to regard the story of Eppia as a sordid banalisation of the myths of Helen and Ariadne, who similarly fled home with their lovers: cf. Edwards 1991, Perelli 1992 and Bellandi 1998: 19–23. Certain details in the Eppia episode support this analysis: her Egyptian destination, the same as Helen's in some versions of the legend, and Eppia's 'forgetting' her obligations to family and fatherland (85–7, 111–12): cf. Sappho, fr. 16.9–12 L–P (quoted 85n.), Eur. *Tro.* 947 (Helen) and Catull. 64.117–20 (Ariadne). But a further model may be in play. Eppia can also be viewed as a sardonic inversion of the loyal wife who resolutely follows her husband into exile or danger, such actions often, as here, involving a sea voyage (App. *B Civ.* 4.39, Val. Max. 6.7.3; App. *B Civ.* 4.48, Plin. *Ep.* 3.16.7–9, Tac. *Ann.* 14.22, *CLE* 1846.11–14, Plut. *Cleom.* 38.3–4; cf. Rosati 1996: 144–55, Parker 1998). Two factors in particular argue for this reading. First, the use of *comitari* in 82. The verb, the *mot juste* for following a friend or beloved into exile or the like, is often applied to the type of the faithful wife under discussion: cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15.71 *Priscum [exulem] Artoria Flaccilla coniunx comitata est, Gallum Egnatia Maximilla, Hist.* 1.3, Sen. *Ben.* 6.25.1–2, Stat. *Theb.* 8.590–1. Second, if, as argued in the introduction §3, J.'s wicked wives systematically overturn key maternal

virtues, Eppia represents a spectacular jettisoning of the ideal of conjugal loyalty (cf. Val. Max. 6.7, Sen. *Controv.* 10.3.2), which reaches its highest expression in wives who bravely follow their spouses into possible danger or death, in defiance of womanly *infirmity sexus*. On the likely historicity of Eppia, see on 112–13.

**82 nupta senatori... ludum:** the key words frame the verse, emphasising the scandalous social degradation to which Eppia voluntarily submits, gladiators being *infames* (Kyle 1998: 80–4). **comitata est:** see 82–113n. Usually such ‘accompaniment’ is motivated by wifely loyalty, here by adulterous lust. **ludum** ‘troupe of gladiators’. Alexandria was the seat of an amphitheatre and an imperial gladiatorial school (Friedländer 1913: 252–3). The troupe of Sergius may have been sent there for a competition or to reinforce the local organisation.

**83 ad Pharon et Nilum famosaque moenia Lagi:** the topographical details suggest the approach to Egypt by sea. The walls of Alexandria (*moenia Lagi*) were the first thing one saw after the island of Pharos with its homonymous lighthouse, which lay just off the western arm of the entrance to the harbour (Strab. 794, map facing Fraser 1972: 1.8). Lagus was the father of the first of the Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt, who styled themselves *Lagidae*. He was memorialised in two places named Λάγειον, one in Alexandria. Alexandria was notorious (*famosa*) for the immorality of its people (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 32.86–90 *et passim*), the Ptolemies included (Strab. 796). The periphrasis *moenia Lagi* has an epicising flavour (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.7 *altae moenia Romae*, Luc. 8.802–3 *Lagi | arua*), ironic here, but also reflecting the imposing appearance of the city’s walls (Diod. Sic. 17.52.3).

**84** Even Canopus (12 miles from Alexandria), a town so infamous for debauchery (Sen. *Ep.* 51.3 *deuorsorium uitiorum*, Juv. 15.46) that a noun, κανωβισμός, was coined to describe the loose living practised there (Strab. 800), was scandalised by the ‘monstrous immorality’ (*prodigia et mores*, hendiadys) of Rome (*urbis*), as embodied in Eppia. Nisbet 1995: 239 suggests *prodigium*: so extreme was Eppia’s behaviour that it was something portentous.

**85 immemor illa domus et coniugis atque sororis** conflates Sappho on Helen (fr. 16.9–12 L–P), who ‘sailed off to Troy, nor was she mindful of (κωῦδ[ἐ... | ... ἐμνάσθῃ) her (?) child or dear parents’, and Catullus 64. *immemor* transfers to Eppia the ‘forgetfulness’ of Theseus in regard to Ariadne (Catull. 64.58, 123, 135, 248), whose action in leaving behind *genitoris... ultum, | ... consanguineae complexum... denique matris* (117–18) was also in J.’s mind. To be parted from close family by sea travel was usually viewed by Romans as deeply painful (*P. Oxy.* 2435.9–13 with Dixon 1991: 101). Eppia shows more insouciance. **domus:** Eppia was oblivious to the

disgrace which her immoral behaviour would bring upon her house in her compatriots' eyes (cf. Saller 1984a: 353–4).

**86** *nil patriae indulsit* 'she showed no concern for her native land', viz. its reputation. *indulsit* is equivalent to *pepercit* (cf. 6.160), rather than *tribuit* or *concessit*. In a similar context, Helen showed a greater sensitivity towards her homeland (Eur. *Tro.* 947, Ov. *Her.* 17.207–9). **improba**: common in J., the adjective characterises Eppia's ruthless disregard for the consequences of her actions upon her family: cf. Mynors on Virg. *G.* 1.145–6.

**87** A deflationary anticlimax. For Eppia to abandon home and family was shocking enough, but for her to forgo the games (Circus and theatrical entertainments) and the pantomime Paris was quite astounding. For missing the games as a disaster cf. Juv. 11.52–3 *ille dolor solus patriam fugientibus, illa | maestitia est, caruisse anno circensibus uno*; for Roman matrons' obsession with *pantomimi* cf. 63–4. Paris is probably the Egyptian (Mart. 11.13) pantomime, so-called Paris II, executed by Domitian in 83 on the grounds of an alleged relationship with his wife Domitia, rather than the Neronian *histrion* of the same name: see Leppin 1992: 272–5. Both chronology (112–13n.) and the great celebrity of Paris II, attested by Martial's epitaph and the existence of a fan-club, *Paridiani* (Franklin 1987: 103–4), support the identification. **utque magis stupeas** 'and more astonishing still'. For the sarcasm cf. Sen. *Ep.* 17.7 *quo magis mireris*. Final clauses containing a comparative are normally introduced by *quo*, but this can be replaced by *ut* in Latin of all periods.

**88–90** *sed quamquam...|...|...pelagus*: the sybaritic upbringing which Eppia enjoyed, particularised in the *de luxe* sleeping arrangements, had scarcely prepared her for the rigours of sea travel, of which nonetheless she made light (*contempsit*). *pluma* is a feather bed. Down, from geese (Plin. *HN* 10.53–4) or swans (Mart. 14.161), was used as stuffing for mattresses (Mart. 9.92.4, Sen. *Prov.* 3.10): it is almost invariably mentioned in contexts of great luxury (Perelli 1992: 196). *segmenta* are pieces of cloth, frequently of costly stuff (Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.169), sewn onto a garment or other substance. *cunae segmentatae* is sometimes explained as a patchwork quilt on Eppia's cradle, but the meaning is more probably a cradle furnished with *toralia segmentata*, valances made from *segmenta*, attached either to the frame of the cradle or to the mattress (cf. Ransom 1905: 69, fig. 37). The contrast around which 88–90 are built may reflect Prop. 3.7.47–50 *noluit hoc Paetus, stridorem audire procellae | et duro teneras laedere fune manus, | sed thyio thalamo aut Oricia terebintho | effultum pluma uersicolore caput*. J. was also thinking of Catull. 64.86–8 *uirgo | regia, quam suavis exspirans castus odores | lectulus in molli complexu matris alebat*.

**89 dormisset:** in classical Latin *quamquam* is normally followed by an indicative, but the rule is relaxed in Latin of the Empire.

**91 molles...cathedras** ‘luxurious ladies’ litters’ (Braund). The chairs are literally soft (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.666 *pilentis matres in mollibus*), but *molles* is also code for ‘female’ (Edwards 1993: 63–97, Mart. 3.63.7 *inter...femineas cathedras*). There is an implied contrast with the *duritia* of the sea voyage (Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.27 *dura nauis*), mention of which is anticipated by *iactura*, literally a ‘jettisoning’ of cargo from a threatened ship. For the metaphor cf. [Sall.] *in Cic.* 1.2 *pudicitiae iactura*, Prop. 2.32.21, Juv. 3.125. **minima** ‘of little account’.

**92–4** Eppia’s courage in facing the terrors of the sea and foreign travel for adulterous purposes inverts the paradigm of the *matrona* who loyally and heroically accompanies her spouse wherever he goes: cf. *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores* n.s. VII 18428 *Antoniae Seuerae coniugi. me propter maria, terras atque aspera caeli sidera trasisti mediosque timenda per h[ostes] inuenisti uiam, hiemis nefanda tulisti*, CIL VI 17690 (intro. n. 103), Treggiari, *RM* 251, 82–113n.

**92–3 Tyrrhenos...fluctus...|...Ionium:** she sailed down the west coast of Italy and through the Straits of Messina, which gave onto the Ionian sea (*Ionium* sc. *pontum*), which lay between the south-east seaboard of Italy and Greece; cf. Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 10.19.

**92 lateque sonantem:** calques Homeric πολύφλοιςβος. The epicism is ironic in this sordid context.

**93 constanti pectore** ‘with a steadfast heart’, in implied contrast to the timorousness expected of women, characterises Eppia as a *matrona uirilis*, but her courage is exercised for ignoble purposes. J. may have in mind a further dignified Greek compound, τλησικάρδιος.

**93–4 quamuis |...mare** ‘[although] she had to sail from sea to sea, before reaching Egypt’ (Duff). Even a voyage from Italy to the west coast of Greece was considered by some to be too arduous for a woman (App. *B Civ.* 4.50): Seneca, *Helv.* 19.5 heaps praises on a woman who *oblita imbecillitatis* [sc. *femineae*], *oblita metuendi etiam firmissimis maris* brought her husband’s body safe to land amidst storm and shipwreck.

**94–5 pericli |...ratio** ‘a reason for incurring danger’.

**95–6 timent pauidoque gelantur | pectore:** the subject is ‘they’, the female sex as a whole, the first of many such essentialising and depersonalising touches in the poem. For the expression cf. Luc. 7.339–40 *stat corde gelato | attonitus*.



**97** Women shed their natural fearfulness in the service of lust (*turpis* frequently refers to sexual misdemeanours). For the stereotype of female timorousness cf. Thuc. 3.74 *τολμηρῶς . . . παρὰ φύσιν*, Columella, *Rust.* 12 *praef.* 5–6, Tac. *Ann.* 3.33. For female bravery inspired by passion, cf. Ov. *Her.* 4.103–4. According to Eur. fr. 271a Kannicht, women are conquered by fear in some circumstances, but in others unsurpassably bold.

**98–9** The force of the mixed conditional (potential subjunctive in the protasis, present indicative in the apodosis: K–S 2.394–5) is that, should a husband bid his wife take ship with him, the drastic consequences described in 98–101 will certainly occur.

**99 tunc . . . tunc:** J. shows a marked preference for *tunc* over *tum*. Various factors determine the choice of one over the other (Gaertner 2007) of which two – that *tunc* is more emphatic and is lower in register – are the most important here. **sentina grauis:** unlike ἀντίλος (Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 796), *sentina* is a realistic term, unusual in poetry. *grauis* = *graeolens*: cf. OLD s.v. 8, Plin. *HN* 10.194 *sentinae . . . nauium odorem*. **tunc summus uertitur aer** ‘then the sky wheels dizzily round’ (Green), from seasickness.

**100 quae moechum sequitur:** for *sequi* of following a lover, cf. Mart. 1.62.5–6 *iuuenemque secuta relicto | coniuge Penelope uenit, abît Helene*, 4.9.2. The chiasmic alliteration of ‘m’ and ‘s’ in 100 is noteworthy.

**100–1 illa maritum | conuomit:** the verb appears elsewhere only in Cic. *Phil.* 2.76 *cum tu Narbone mensas hospitum conuomeres*. The prefix has an intensifying function (‘she spews all over her husband’), a secondary development from its original force of doing something ‘together’ (Leumann 1975: 94). *con-* may also suggest instantaneousness (cf. *concidere*, Bellandi 1998: 13): the sickness comes upon her in a moment. Verbs prefixed by intensifying *con-* often have, as here, a conspicuously vulgar tone: cf. *confutuere* (Catull. 37.5), *concacare* (Sen. *Apocol.* 4), *conspuere* (Fur. Bibac. fr. 15 Courtney, *FLP*).

**101–2** Combines several points: (1) the insouciance of the maritime adulteress (*haec*), in contrast to her counterpart (*illa*), who ventures on board ship only at her husband’s command, (2) self-degradation: *prandere* belongs to the *sermo castrensis*, debasing her by lexical association, and in combination with *inter nautas* imputes to her unladylike behaviour: Roman *matronae* ought not mix freely with common sailors, whose status was extremely low (Juv. 8.174–7, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 17.20; also Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.11), (3) a hint at her erotic appetites: *tractare* is often used of sexual touching (Adams, *LSV* 186–7) and sailors, whose company she shares, were notorious for amours (Watson *ibid.*); hence *rudentes* comes

as a deflationary surprise after *duros tractare*. 102 drastically recontextualises the childish innocence of Virg. *Aen.* 2.238–9 *pueri circum innuptaeque puellae* | ... *funemque manu contingere gaudent*.

**103** Where exactly was the youth and beauty that aroused Eppia to such heights of passion? For (105–9) Sergius had neither. *iuuenta*, commoner and less elevated than *iuventas* (Heck 1970), is notably ironic given the brutal realism of 105–9. **capta**: supply *est* to provide a balance with the finite verb *exarsit*.

**104 quid uidit**: what did she see in him? **ludia**: by eloping with Sergius, Eppia invited the degrading (Sassi 1995), appellation *ludia*, a woman attached to a gladiatorial school who provided for a gladiator's sexual needs (Watson and Watson 1996: 588–91).

**105 Sergiolus** 'her darling Sergius': an affectionate diminutive (ὑποκόρισμα) applied to Sergius by Eppia (cf. Catull. 12.17 *Veraniolum*, 45.13 *Septimille*). It also reflects the occasional tendency of gladiatorial names to assume such a form: cf. *Veianolus* (ILS 5136) or *Aureolus* (Mosci Sassi 1992: 187–8). Sergius is not a typical gladiator's name: these tend to be Grecising or to advertise prowess in the art. If the name is real, one could think of a member of the *gens Sergia* who had submitted to an *auctoramentum* and turned gladiator. J. might also have in mind Cicero's characterisation of *Sergius Catilina* as a gladiator, e.g. *Mur.* 50 (James Uden).

**105–6 radere guttur** | **coeperat** 'had started shaving', i.e. was past his youth – giving the lie to *iuuenta* 103. Until the time of Hadrian, who made beards fashionable for men of all ages, older men went clean-shaven, while those up to the age of 40 commonly wore small beards (Cic. *Att.* 1.14.5.3–4 with Shackleton Bailey, Gell. *NA* 3.4, Marquardt 1886: 600, and for iconographic evidence Walker 1991: 271–2). The casual reference to shaving tells against a Hadrianic date for *Satire* 6 (cf. 398–412n.).

**106 et secto ... lacerto**: not only is Sergius getting on in years, but his fighting capacity has become impaired. Commentators usually explain *secto* as 'mutilated', but Bellandi 1998: 13 makes a powerful case for 'operated upon' by the doctors attached to the *ludus*, after suffering a wound: Sergius continues to feel the after-effects of the surgery, hence his hopes for a discharge. For *secare* as a technical term of surgery see *OLD* s.v. 3d, 4b.

**107–9**: the *sicut* of the MSS, 'as for example' (K–S 2.450), is otiose. Nisbet's *sulcus* (1995: 239–40), a 'furrow' in the skin (cf. ἄλωξ) produced by the rubbing of the helmet, yields a neat *tricolon crescens* (cf. *multa... deformia* 107): (1) the *sulcus*, (2) the nasal wart, (3) the weeping

eye. The surviving gladiatorial helmets studied by K–E 40–5 seem eminently capable of producing just such a facial *sulcus*.

**108–9 mediisque in naribus ingens | gibbus:** *gibbus*, literally a hump, is used hyperbolically of a rounded excrescence or growth. Not only is it huge (*ingens*), it is located prominently in mid-face: *nares*, properly ‘nostrils’, stands for *nasus*, as often in poetry.

**109 acre...ocelli:** ‘acer... is often applied to bodily humours’ (Courtney). Sergius suffers from chronic (*semper*) *lippitudo* (cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.81 *diuturna lippitudo*), an eye complaint characterised (Celsus, *Med.* 6.6.1A–B) by tears and rheum (cf. *stillantis*; *lippus* is lit. ‘watery’: so Fortson 2008: 52–9). *lippitudo* was regarded as disfiguring: cf. Mart. 4.65, 6.39.11 and the unflattering depictions of sufferers from ocular disease in Goldman 1943: 22–4, figs. 1, 3, 4. Although *lippitudo* was endemic in southern lands (*RE* XIII 724–6), it was especially associated with persons of dubious character e.g. Ar. *Eccl.* 398–404, *Plut.* 665–6, Lys. 14.25, Mart. 6.78, 8.9. The diminutive *ocellus* has depreciatory force with reference to the disfigured eye, but is also pointedly contrasted with *ingens* (*gibbus*).

**110** Gladiators supposedly exercised great sexual allure over women (Mart. 5.24.10 with W–W, Hopkins 1983: 21–3). Even the likes of Sergius is made by his profession to appear a Hyacinthus, the paradigm of youthful loveliness (Opp. *Cyn.* 1.358–62, Mellink 1943: 173). Gladiators would advertise their supposed attractiveness by adopting as stage-names those of famously beautiful males, such as Paris, Hylas and Narcissus (Carter 1999: 265). An epitaph for a slain *retiarius* (Robert 1950: 44–6) explicitly celebrates his beauty (lines 1–2), comparing him to Hyacinthus (4).

**111–12** resumes the theme of 85–6. The repeated *hoc* is deeply sarcastic: ‘this is what she preferred to home and family’.

**112 ferrum...amant** ‘it’s the blade that they love’ i.e. the sex and violence embodied in gladiators, whose virility was inferred from their perceived hypermasculinity and whose swords could be seen as phallic symbols (Adams, *LSV* 20–1). For the attraction of bedding a male who kills cf. Ov. *Ar.* 2.715–16.

**112–13 hic... | ...uideri:** if Sergius had retired from the arena (113n.), he would seem no more interesting to Eppia than her own husband. It is likely that Veiento is the consular A. Didius Gallus Fabricius Veiento, one of the most important personages of the Flavian, especially the Domitianic era (Juv. 4.113, 123–9, Schol. Vallae on 4.94, Plin. *Ep.* 9.13.19, McDermott 1970). An inscription which cannot be earlier than AD 83 (*CIL* XIII 7253) mentions a wife, Attica. Since the most likely candidate for the pantomime Paris whom Eppia leaves behind to elope to Egypt was executed in

83 (87n.), it seems probable that Eppia was Veiento's first wife and Attica his second. McDermott 1970: 135 holds that Eppia might be a pseudonym for Attica and since pantomimic names were inherited (Bonaria 1959), the Paris of 87 could in principle be a later bearer of the name than Paris II and the whole episode be set post-83. But there seems no rationale for employing a pseudonym for Attica, given the prominence of the historical Veiento and the unusual character of his name. As an alternative to the above, some commentators treat Veiento simply as the type of the decrepit husband. In fact the two approaches may easily be combined. Veiento was probably born in the mid-20s (Rutledge 2001: 230), so, if the scandal took place in the early Domitianic period, he would by then have been getting on in years; indeed, his name may conceivably pun on *uietus*: cf. Ter. *Eun.* 688 *hic est uietu' uetu' ueternus senex*. See further Bellandi 1998: 2–4.

**113 rude:** a wooden wand awarded to a gladiator to symbolise his release from the *ludus*: so Coleman on Mart. *Spect.* 31.9, citing a relief depicting a freed gladiator who sports such a wand, and rejecting the traditional rendering 'wooden sword'. But *rudis* can also mean an inoffensive weapon (cf. 6.248, Suet. *Calig.* 32.2 *murmillonem e ludo rudibus secum battuentem et sponte prostratum confodit ferrea sica*, Mosci Sassi 1992: 164–5). Consequently, while *rudis* primarily signals Sergius' retirement from the arena and hence his loss of charms in Eppia's eyes, there is also a secondary contrast between *ferrum*, real sword (hence sexually arousing, 112) and *rudis* (play-sword, thus less exciting).

**114–32** *So you think that what Eppia did was bad enough? What Claudius endured was still worse. His empress Messalina moonlighted each night as a meretrix in a cheap brothel, behaving in every respect like a real prostitute.*

Whorish activities were imputed to Messalina by the Elder Pliny (*HN* 10.172): according to Dio Cass. 60.31.1 she actually practised as a prostitute. Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.26–38) is more restrained, stating only that she *ad incognitas libidines profluebat*. The charge of prostitution could well be an extrapolation from the voraciousness of her sexual appetite (Tac. *Ann.* 11.26 *facilitate adulteriorum*, Dio Cass. 60.22.4–5 etc., Plin. *HN* 29.8, 20), which crossed class boundaries and caused her to be styled 'the most prostituted (πορνικωτάτη) and licentious of women' (Dio Cass. 60.14.3). Certainly the accusation often levelled against sexually adventurous ladies of the upper class, that they had turned themselves into prostitutes (e.g. Cic. *Cael.* 49 *et passim*, Sen. *Ben.* 6.32.1), provides a formal template for J.'s sensational account. Moreover, there was an anecdotal tradition of high-class women who engaged, willingly or otherwise, in prostitution (McGinn 1998a, Flemming 1999: 53–4, Herter 2003: 69). On such grounds J.'s description of Messalina is no longer accepted by most historians as literally true (McGinn 2004: 217). See further Questa 1995, Joshel 1997.

The Messalina-section is linked to the preceding one by a number of themes: see intro. 14–16.

**114 priuata:** in contrast to the imperial house (115).

**115 riuales diuorum:** i.e. the Roman emperors, who came to be viewed as deities upon earth (Latte 1960: 315–16); but, as the next word shows, the reference is primarily to Claudius, who was addressed as *diuinus princeps* in the *Acta Fratrum Arualium* (CIL VI 2034.7–8), allowed the state worship of his *genius* (Gradel 2002: 164–88) and was described by Scribonius Largus (*praef.*, 60, 163) as *deus noster Caesar*. The mock-grandiosity of the phrase underscores the humiliations to which Messalina subjected the quasi-god during his lifetime. Claudius' *post mortem* deification is not relevant here: J. reserves his sneers on the matter for later (620–3).

**116–19** The order of the lines as they appear in the MSS cries out for alteration. With the transmitted text, *et* 117 must be rendered, improbably, as 'even' and an awkward asyndeton posited between *sumere* and *praeferre* (both dependent on *ausa* if the MSS order is retained). Various solutions have been suggested. Best is to reverse the order of 117 and 118. This yields a satisfactory temporal sequence: Messalina notes that Claudius has fallen asleep (116): she dons the disguise needed for going to the brothel (118), thereby expressing her preference for brothel-sex over the imperial bed (117): she quits the palace (119). Nonetheless the gap between *linquebat* and its object *uirum* remains troubling. For other suggested schemata, see Courtney and Braund.

**118 sumere... cucullos:** the *cucullus* was a hood or a mantle with a hood, of Gaulish provenance (Niedermann 1950: 152–3, de Saint-Denis 1967: 440–3). As a garb of the *plebs sordida* (SHA *Verus* 4.6), it underscores the descent *de haut en bas* suggested by *meretrix Augusta*. Muffling the head was a gesture of disguise (Cowan 2008: 316–17), often associated with visits to brothels (Cic. *Pis.* 13, Petron. 7.4, SHA *Heliogab.* 32.9) and practised elsewhere by high-status persons engaged in sexual intrigues (Juv. 8.144–5, Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.55, Suet. *Ner.* 26). In the case of brothel visits, the head was normally covered to conceal one's patronage of such establishments rather than, as here, employment therein; cf., however, Dio Cass. 80.13.2 (an associate of Elagabalus). **sumere:** with the sequence of lines adopted here (116–19n.), *sumere* is best taken as a historic infinitive expressing repeated action after frequentive *cum* 116: cf. Ter. *Hec.* 181–3 *siquando ad eam accesserat | confabulatum, fugere e conspectu ilico, | uidere nolle*. **nocturnos:** brothels did not open till the ninth hour (Schol. Juv. 6.117, Herter 2003: 80 n. 319). **meretrix Augusta** 'whore-Empress', a sneer inspired by Propertius' characterisation of Cleopatra, *meretrix regina Canopi* (3.11.39: cf. Plin. *HN* 9.119), both original and adaptation gaining extra point from

the fact that female whores were normally slaves (δοῦλα σώματα Dio Chrys. Or. 7.138, Treggiari 1971, McGinn 2004: 55–61). Such oxymora are not uncommon: cf. *adultera meretrix* ILS 9455, *uxor lupa* Apul. Apol. 75 and for similar effects in Juv. 8.148 *mulio consul* and 198–9 *citharoedo principe mimus* | *nobilis*. **Augusta**: an anachronistic designation for Messalina (who was actually refused the title by Claudius: Dio Cass. 60.12.5), reflecting the second-century dilution of the term to mean the wife of the emperor, as opposed to its original sense of the reigning emperor's mother (see Flory 1997). Vidén 1993: 146 detects in the application of the term to Messalina an ironic contrast with the irreproachable Livia, the first Augusta.

**117 ausa** 'having the nerve to', τολμῶσα. There may be a perverted recall of *aude* at Virg. Aen. 8.364: both Aeneas and Messalina enter humble premises. **tegetem**: a rush mat used for venal or extramarital sex (Mart. 6.39.4, Anth. Pal. 11.328.11–12), pointedly contrasted with *cubili*, the marital bed, but associated as well with poverty and degraded circumstances (Henriksen on Mart. 9.92.3), hence also opposed in sense to *Palatino*.

**119 comite...una** 'on ordinary excursions the Empress would have many [handmaids]' Courtney. J.'s Messalina shows greater circumspection in regard to her brothel activities than Tacitus' when conducting her affair with Silius (Tac. Ann. 11.12 *illa non furtim sed multo comitatu uentitare domum [Sili]*).

**120 sic** 'like this' (Ribbeck), pointing Messalina's transformation from Empress to whore, is preferable to the colourless *sed* of the MSS. **flauo...galero**: Messalina wears a wig, *galerus* (Suet. Ner. 26, Otho 12), partly for purposes of disguise (cf. Suet. Calig. 11, Ner. 26, Dio Cass. 80.13.2), partly to enhance her appearance. The wearing of wigs by *demi-mondaines* had been in fashion since Ovid's day (Am. 1.14.45–6, Ars 3.165–6), particularly blonde ones (cf. O16 *flaua...lupa*) derived from Germany (Mart. 5.68, 14.26), whose natives had hair of a reddish-gold colour (Mayor on Juv. 13.164–5 *Germani...flauam* | *caesariem*, Sieglin 1935). The pointed juxtaposition *nigrum flauo* underscores Messalina's doffing of her normal persona for that of the prostitute.

**121 intrauit**: the difference in tense between *intrauit* and *linquebat* 119 perturbs Courtney. But *linquebat*, part of a frequentative sequence involving *cum* with pluperfect followed by imperfect, expresses habitual action, whereas *intrauit* focalises the actual moment of Messalina's entry to the brothel (for *intrare* in such a context cf. Mart. 11.45.1, Sen. Controv. 1.2.10): cf. Cic. Tusc. 1.72 *ita enim censebat itaque disseruit* [Socrates] *duas esse vias duplicesque cursus animorum e corpore excedentium*, where *censebat* refers to opinions long cherished, but *disseruit* to Socrates' discourse on the matter in the *Phaedo*. **calidum...lupanar**: *calidum* suggests the close and fetid

atmosphere of brothels and taverns, which doubled as brothels (McGinn 2004: 15–19): cf. Juv. 11.81 *calidae...popinae*, 131–2nn. **ueteri centone**: ablative of description, of a curtain which screened the entrance to the brothel (Petron. 7.2–4 *in locum secretiorem uenimus, centonem anus urbana reiecit...intellexi me in fornicem esse deductum*; also Mart. 1.34.5, 11.45.3, the curtain of the individual *cella*), one of the minimal concessions to privacy in such establishments (Herter 2003: 82). Along with *calidum* and *ueteri*, the patchwork nature of the curtain (Schol. *uelo ex pannis facto*) emphasises the seediness of the brothel, by contrast with the imperial palace.

**122 et cellam...suam**: the *cella* was a ‘crib’ within the brothel, where the prostitute entertained her customers: cf. Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.1 *quid in cellulam me et obscenum lectulum uocas?*, Suet. *Calig.* 41.1, Mart. 11.45.1, McGinn 2004: 215, with fig. 6. *uacuam atque suam* intimates that the *cella* was reserved exclusively for Messalina. It is unclear whether this was standard practice: a passage of Petronius, *Sat.* 8.4, could argue either way. **nuda**: prostitutes within the brothel were generally naked or near-naked: cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.309–10, Petron. 7.3 *uideo quosdam inter titulos nudasque meretrices furtim spatiantes*, Juv. 11.172–3, Herter 2003: 88–9. Besides inciting desire, this lack of garb ensured that the customer could see exactly what he was getting: cf. Philemon, fr. 3.10 K–A, Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.83–5, 101–3.

**122–3 papillis | ...auratis**: *papillae* has a markedly erotic colour (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 8.7), appropriate in this highly sexualised context. There is evidence that *demi-mondaines* affected gold in their clothing or as ornaments (Tib. 2.3.57–8, Ov. *Ars* 2.299, *Anth. Pal.* 6.206.7–8, Ath. 587b), but we do not hear elsewhere of nipples covered with gold leaf, presumably the sense here. Gold, having regal associations (Plaut. *Epid.* 222–3, Ov. *Fast.* 2.310–11), also hints at the true status of ‘Lycisca’.

**123 prostitit**: whores ‘stood in front’ of the brothel or before their *cellae* to solicit, whence the secondary meaning ‘to be a prostitute’ (Adams 1983a: 329–32). Both senses are in play here. **titulum mentita Lyciscae**: above the *cella* was placed a *titulus*, ‘notice’ (Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.5) bearing the name and price of its occupant: cf. *Hist. Ap. Tyr.* 33 *cella ornetur diligenter, in qua scribatur titulus: ‘qui Tarsiam uirginem uiolare uoluerit, dimidiam auri libram dabit: postea uero singulos aureos populo patebit’*. *mentita*, ‘counterfeiting’, points to concealment of identity and the whore’s practice of adopting a professional title (Herter 2003: 67). *Lycisca*, ‘Little Wolf’ (from λύκος, ‘wolf’), reflects the tendency of Roman prostitutes to have Greek names: likewise the tendency for prostitute names to be in diminutive form (cf. *Lagisca*, *Myrriniske*, *Telesilla*, *Moscharion*) and derived from the animal kingdom (*RE* VIII 1362–71, McClure 2003: 71–3), wolves included (Mart.

4.17 (Lycisca), Hor. *Carm.* 3.10, 4.13). Most important, the name conjures up its Latin correlate *lupa*, a term for the lowest kind of whore (O16 nn.), which supposedly derived from the rapacity of the class (Isid. *Etym.* 18.42.2, also McClure 2003: 73). Messalina has turned her *altera ego* into the authentic article.

**124** J.'s characterisation of Messalina makes her a bizarre hybrid, at once cheap prostitute and mother of a prince. For *ostendo* of sexual display, cf. Sen. *Ben.* 7.9.5 and the comparable use of ἐπιδείκνυμι and ἐπιδεικνύω (Hdt. 1.11, Xen. *Mem.* 3.11.1). **ostenditque ... uentrem:** *uenter*, like γαστήρ, is used with particular reference to pregnancy: cf. Dio Cass. 61.13.5 '[Agrippina] bared her belly (γαστέρα) and said "strike here...for this bore Nero"', Tac. *Ann.* 14.8. *protendens uterum*, '*uentrem feri*' *exclamauit* (a detail perhaps in J.'s mind here), Thomas 1986. Messalina's fertility was emphasised in iconography (Mikocki 1995: 44–5), imparting a further layer of irony to the line. **tuum, generose Britannice, uentrem:** the apostrophe adds a tone of elevation amusingly at odds with the context. **generose:** as the son of the Emperor Claudius – himself the grandson of Augustus' wife Livia – and of Messalina, great-granddaughter of Augustus' sister Octavia, Tiberius Claudius Caesar Britannicus was indeed 'high-born'. The surname was added after his father's invasion of Britain in AD 43.

**125** *excepit blanda intrantes atque aera poposcit* combines in one line three defining characteristics of the prostitute: (1) the anonymity of her customers (*intrantes*): the prostitute takes all comers (cf. Sen. *Ben.* 6.32.1, Ulp. *Dig.* 23.2.43 *praef.* 1–3); (2) the use of blandishments (Plaut. *Cas.* 585–6 *officiumst... meretricium*, | *uiris alienis... subblandirier*, Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.12 *si quis dubitabit an meretrix esset audiat quam blanda sit*, cf. 191n., Herter 2003: 92); (3) the exacting of money for sexual services (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.10.21: for evidence on prices see McGinn 2004: 40–55). **aera poposcit:** Messalina demanded cash in advance. Given that she is determined to replicate the usage of authentic prostitutes, it is reasonable to assume (cf. Herter 2003: 71) that this was standard practice.

**126:** found only in late MSS (with a variant *ac resupina iacens*) and best deleted. Linguistically, it is unexceptionable: for *absorbuit* cf. Juv. 10.223, for *ictus*, Anth. *Lat.* 712.19 Riese *dent crebros ictus*, for *resupina*, Juv. 3.112. But the argument offered in its defence, that the line was excised on the grounds of decency, is shaky given the retention of 129–30, with its scabrous anatomical precision; it also preempts the concluding effect of their startling obscenity. 126 is likely the work of an interpolator who felt the need to plug the situational gap between 125 and 127, perhaps drawing on Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.49 *quaecumque excepit turgentis uerbera caudae*.



**127 lenone suas...dimittente puellas:** the *leno* was ‘primarily a manager of slaves prostituted in taverns, inns and bath-houses, as well as brothels’ (Flemming 1999: 51). Messalina’s departure following the *leno*’s ‘dismissal of his girls’ at the end of their shift means that she is numbered among these, who – herself apart – are slave-prostitutes attached to the brothel which the *leno* operates. To be lumped with such low (Edwards 1997) women and to receive orders from a *leno* – a despised type (Knox and Headlam 1922: xxxviii–ix), *infamis* under Roman law (*Dig.* 3.2.1) – is the *ne plus ultra* in self-abasement. **puellas:** a common euphemism for *meretrices* (Adams 1983a: 344–8).

**128–30:** J.’s Messalina exemplifies the widespread belief that the sexual desire of females far exceeded that of males (Aesch. *Cho.* 594–7, Ov. *Ars* 1.281–2, 341–2, Carson 1990: 138–45, Myers 1996: 6 n. 38), likewise the conviction that some women turned to prostitution from excess of lust: cf. Anacr. 346 fr. 1 Page, Lycophr. 1385–7 with Schol., Firm. Mat. *Math.* 6.31.91 *sed haec quaestus et libidinis causa pudorem suum et duobus fratribus nundinabit, et ad coitum suum patrem pariter inuitabit et filium. omnia enim haec immodico ardore libidinis [et] effrenata pecuniarum cupiditate perficiet*, McGinn 2004: 69.

**128 abît:** perfect. **quod potuit tamen** ‘the best she could do, however’: cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 3.70 *quod potui* with Clausen.

**128–9 ultima...| clausit:** the entrance to a *cella* was secured with a curtain or, as here, by a door (or both in combination): cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.14.9–10, Mart. 1.34.5, 11.45.3, *Hist. Ap. Tyr.* 34 *solito [more] puella claudit ostium*.

**129 adhuc...uoluae:** avoided in the higher poetic genres and coarse in tone (cf. Pers. 6.73 *patriciae immeiat uoluae*, Juv. 2.32–3), *uolua* is properly the womb, but is also used of other parts of the female genitalia. It here refers to the clitoris (*landica*): cf. Cael. Aurel. *Gynaecia* 2.112 p. 113 Drabkin and Drabkin, speaking of the *tentigo*, ‘erection’, of the *landica* – a recognised phenomenon caused by sexual arousal – in similar terms to here: *quibusdam landicis horrida comitatur magnitudo et feminas partium feditate confundit et, ut plerique memorant, ipse adfecte tentigine uirorum similem appetentiam sumunt et in uenerem coacte ueniunt*. Since both *rigidus* and *tentigo* normally refer to penile erection (Adams, *LSV* 103), Messalina, it is implied, exhibits an aggressive sexuality more usually associated with males: cf. the (typically masculine) image of ploughing used to characterise Lesbia’s rabid sexual appetite at Catull. 11.24.

**130 lassata uiris:** *uiris* is probably ablative rather than dative of agent after the part participle. The omission of *a* before *uiris* depersonalises the *uiri*, making them simply the tool of Messalina’s pleasure: when prepositional

*a* is dropped before a personal noun in the ablative, the focus is on *instrumentality* rather than agency. Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.94 *curatus inaequali tonsore capillos* (the barber is viewed as an extension of his shears), Juv. 1.13, 54, K–S 1.380, H–S 122. For *lassare* of ‘wearing out’ by sexual exertions cf. Tib. 1.9.55–6. **necdum satiata**: writings on prostitution in Antiquity invariably stress the commodification of the female body as an outlet for male sexual release (e.g. McClure 2003 *passim*). Here the boot is decidedly on the other foot.

**131–2 turpis...| foeda**: the primary sense of both *turpis* (going with *obscuris genis*) and *foeda* is ‘befouled’. Her cheeks are ‘filthy’ from the soot and smoke of the lamp which lit the *cella*: cf. *Priap.* 14.10 *nigra fornicis oblitus fauilla*, Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.21, Mart. 4.4.9. But the adjectives also have an ethical dimension, *turpis* in particular being associated with debased sexuality. Ancient brothels are standardly described as filthy, unwholesome places (Herter 2003: 77, McGinn 2004: 20), in terms, however, which suggest that the squalor was moral as well as physical (for filth as a trope for degraded behaviour see Gowers 1995).

**132 lupanaris...odore**: we hear much of the ‘stink’ of the brothel (Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.30 *olenti in fornice stantem*, Juv. 11.172–3), to which the lamps were a contributory factor (Sen., Mart. prev. n.) and which was supposedly powerful enough to remain about one’s person after leaving the brothel: cf. Cic. *Pis.* 13, Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.21 *redolet adhuc fuliginem fornicis*. **puluinar** = a couch or bed for the gods or, as here, persons who received divine honours (cf. Sen. *Cons. Pol.* 16.4, Suet. *Dom.* 13.1). Juxtaposition with *lupanaris... odorem* brings into association two normally irreconcilable things.

**133–5** *What need to speak of stepmothers who deploy love-charms against their stepsons? Women do still worse (135n.) under the compulsion of lust.*

These lines, a *praeteritio* (*loquar...?* 133), exemplify the extremes to which female lust proceeds via the stock figure of the *nouerca* who falls in love with her stepson (Watson 1995: index s.vv. ‘stepmothers, amorous’), and seeks to win his affection by means of amatory magic: a tactic seemingly used by Phaedra, the best-known amorous stepmother, in Euripides’ first *Hippolytus* and alluded to in the second *Hippolytus* (Watson 1993). The transition at 133 from the Messalina-scene is abrupt, and *faciunt grauiora* gives rise to the expectation that more sensational activities than Caesenia’s adultery (136–41) will follow. On these grounds some editors have excised 133–5, or transposed them. We are inclined to retain the lines, as forming a climax to the Messalina-section and on the basis that *imperio sexus* 135 neatly encapsulates the uncontrollable (128–30) lust of females as embodied in the empress.

**133 hippomanes:** a highly potent love-inducing substance (616–17n.). **carmenque** ‘spell’: cf. Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 5.72. **coctumque:** *coquo* = ‘concoct’ a magic brew or poison (*OLD* 1b). **uenenum:** in the context must have its original sense, ‘love-charm’ (626n.), and not, as sometimes translated, ‘poison’.

**134–5 coactae | imperio sexus:** ‘compelled by the dictates of their gender’. The sexual desire felt by females, supposedly far greater than male desire (128–30n.), is elevated to the status of a compulsion. For *imperium* cf. Juv. 15.138 *naturae imperio*.

**135 summumque libidine peccant:** the MSS read *minimumque*, ‘the very least of their sins are the product of lust’, which is intolerable after the focus in the previous lines on the *extremes* to which *libido* drives women. Something like *peiusque* (Courtney) or, better, *summumque* (Courtney 1966: 39–40) is needed to balance *grauiora*. Textual corruption involving the substitution of words of opposite meaning is far from uncommon (Briggs Jr. 1983, Oakley on Liv. 7.26.11).

**136–41** ‘But why is Caesennia described by her husband as a paragon?’ Because she brought a large dowry. That’s why he calls her chaste, despite the evidence to the contrary.

An interlocutor (presumably Postumus) objects that there *are* some perfect women: Caesennia for example. But J. counters by suggesting that her husband’s passion stems from Caesennia’s *dos* (138–9), and that he turns a blind eye to her infidelities in order to retain the use of this (137n.). J.’s reply adverts to the first of three canonically misguided reasons for marrying – wealth, beauty and noble birth (38–81n.): the latter two are addressed in the succeeding sections (142–60, 161–83).

In cautions against wedding for the sake of the dowry or the bride’s wealth two ideas stand out, both developed by J. here.

- (1) To marry for money means loss of freedom, for wealthy wives exploit their financial position to lord it over their husbands: cf. Anaxandr. fr. 53.4–6 K–A, Eur. fr. 502 Kannicht [if one marries a woman who is superior in birth or rich] ‘the domination of the wife in the house enslaves the husband, and he is no longer free’, Stob. 4.536 (Nicos-tratus, *On marriage*, who speaks of the husband’s ‘slavery’). Of particular relevance is the domineering *uxor dotata* of New Comedy who uses the threat of reclaiming her dowry (in the event of divorce) to enforce domestic tyranny (Schuhmann 1977: 50–5). See further Hierocles, *On marriage* ap. Stob. 4.506, Stob. 4.687 (Callicratides the Pythagorean, *On domestic happiness*), N–R on Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.19–20. For a more balanced view of the situation see intro. 43–4.

- (2) The character of a prospective wife is more important than any wealth she might bring: cf. [Hippon.] ap. Stob. 4.546–7 (the best dowry is to get a wife of good character), Diodorus, fr. 3 K–A, Muson. 13b, Plut. *Amat.* 754a. Of especial pertinence are some (probably spurious) lines at Eur. *El.* 1097–9 ‘whoever, with an eye to wealth or high birth, marries an evil woman, is a fool. For a wife of modest station within the house who is chaste is better than a distinguished one who is not’ and Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.19–20 *nec dotata regit uirum | coniunx nec nitido fudit adultero*: hints of sexual misbehaviour which J. develops into an outrageous, elegiacally coloured picture of a libertine *dotata uxor* who openly inscribes *billets doux* to her lover at a banquet.

**136 Caesennia:** suggests an upper-class woman. The Caesennii were a leading senatorial family of Etruscan origin, still prominent in J.’s day: details in Syme 1984: 1043–61, Ferguson 1987: 40–1.

**137 bis quingena dedit** ‘she gave him twice five hundred’ [sc. *milia sester-tium*], i.e. a million sesterces, the property qualification for the senatorial class. This is the conventional amount for a wealthy woman’s dowry in literature (e.g. Mart. 11.23, 12.75.8, Juv. 10.335), though it is possible that the very wealthy gave much more: see Saller 1984b: 200–2, Treggiari, *RM* 340–50. **tanti uocat ille pudicam** ‘for such a price he calls her faithful’. To avoid losing the enjoyment of his wife’s dowry – the husband’s prerogative as long as the marriage lasted – the husband turns a blind eye to her infidelities. Acknowledgement of adultery involved a husband divorcing his wife before prosecuting her for *adulterium*, and even if her guilt were proved, he only had the legal right to retain one-sixth of the dowry (Treggiari, *RM* 350–3).

**138** rightly excised by Scholte, Courtney 1975: 158–9 and Nisbet 1995: 240 on the grounds that it breaks the connection between *tanti* and *inde* 139. Line 138 is little more than a flat doublet of 139.

**139 inde faces ardent, ueniunt a dote sagittae:** a delicious paradox (made the more so by the conventionality of the imagery which it subverts). The husband’s passion (*faces*) for Caesennia is financial not physical, the arrows that pierce his heart issue from her dowry, not the quiver of Cupid. For the transferred use of *faces* (poetic plural), cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.9.13–14 with N–R. The metaphor is connected with the torch (*lampas, faces*) which Cupid wields to inspire love (Ov. *Am.* 1.2.45–6 with McKeown).

**140–1** the combination of her wealth and her husband’s greed (cf. 137 *tanti... pudicam* n.) frees her from the risk of prosecution for adultery and thus allows her sexual *carte blanche*. In this respect, she resembles a *uidua* (single woman, divorcee or widow), who enjoyed greater sexual freedom

than a *matrona* because she could not be charged with *adulterium* but only with *stuprum* (Fantham 1991: 290), a lesser offence and one in practice rarely brought to court (Gardner 1986: 124–5).

**140 *libertas emitur*:** for marriage to a wealthy wife characterised in the language of commerce, cf. Eur. *Phaethon* 158–9 Diggle, Plaut. *Asin.* 87 *argentum accepi, dote imperium uendidi*. The wife's *libertas* overturns the conventional sentiment (Eur. fr. 545.1 Kannicht) 'every σῶφρων (self-restrained, chaste) wife is a slave of her husband'.

**140–1 *coram licet innuat atque | rescribat*:** the husband plays the rôle of the *leno maritus* who purposely ignores secret courtship signs, usually for profit (cf. McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.19.57, N–R on Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.29–30). Here, he simply wants to avoid losing access to his wife's dowry (137n.). The context is thoroughly elegiac, but J. is thinking especially of Ov. *Ars* 2.543–6, where the poet advises the lover to put up with a rival: *innuet illa: feras; scribet: ne tange tabellas | ... hoc in legitima praestant uxore mariti, | cum, tener, ad partes tu quoque, Somne, uenis*.

**140 *coram*** sc. *marito* 'in her husband's presence': a sign of her domination of him. Cf. Tib. 1.2.21 *uïro coram nutus conferre loquaces*, Men. fr. 817 K–A, Ov. *Am.* 1.4.17–28. ***licet innuat*** 'she can nod as much as she likes', *innuat* referring to covert gestures exchanged between lovers – traditionally in a banquet setting (see Ov. *Am.* 1.4.17–28 with McKeown).

**141 *rescribat*:** it was conventional for the man to write declaring his sexual interest in a woman and for her to answer, *rescribere* (Ov. *Am.* 1.11.19, 2.2.5–6, *Ars* 1.481–6, Mart. 2.9). ***auaro*:** i.e. a man who marries for money rather than love.

**142–60** 'But surely some men marry out of passion – Sertorius, for example.' No. If the truth be told, it's her looks, not his wife, that he is in love with. As soon as these start to deteriorate, she will be given her marching orders, to be replaced in short order by a younger woman. Meanwhile she rules the roost, and he indulges her every expensive whim.

Having in 136–41 touched upon one of the traditionally misconceived reasons for taking a wife, wealth, J. now addresses a second member of that triad, beauty. Of especial note are Hierocles, *On marriage* ap. Stob. 4.506 'some marry for the size of the dowry, others on account of surpassing attractiveness... employing which as bad counsellors... they introduce over themselves a tyrant, not a wife' and Antipater, *On living with a wife* (3.254 von Arnim) '[one should woo circumspectly], not having regard either to wealth or arrogant nobility of birth... or, by heavens, to beauty. For this pretty well invariably results in pride and a tyrannical disposition.' In both passages beauty is not merely an unsound reason for marrying, but also leads to wifely

domination – exactly as Bibula here ‘lords it over the household’ (*regnat* 149), so long as her looks hold up. Also pertinent is Antipater, *On marriage* 3.256 von Arnim, ‘life with a wife seems to some to be disagreeable because of their inability to master pleasure, being instead slaves to it, and because some caught by beauty, others by a dowry, in dependence on pleasure, of their own volition gratify their wife and do not teach her anything about domestic economy or about improving the financial position of the house’. This connects with J.’s strictures here against the husband’s reckless indulgence of his wife’s outrageously spendthrift ways, so long as he remains in erotic thrall to her.

Husbands receive a very poor press in *Sat.* 6. One instance is a second commonplace informing 142–60, the inconstancy of the *amator* whose passion lasts only as long as the love-object’s beauty retains its youthful perfection: a case of physical desire, not love (*facies non uxor amatur* 143). The idea is best known from Pl. *Symp.* 183d–e (‘that popular lover, who loves the body rather than the soul... along with the fading of the bloom of the body which he loved “he flies off and is gone”’). There it is the lover who takes himself off, whereas here it is the wife who is given her marching orders (144–8): but the underlying concept is the same. The idea resurfaces in Alexis’ *Helen* (fr. 70 K–A), ‘whoever loves the youthful beauty of the body, but does not recognise [the existence of] the remaining part of a person’s life, is a lover of pleasure, not of those who are dear to him’ (1–3) and survives as late as Aristaenetos (*Epist.* 2.1.41–3 Mazal). Although the cliché is essentially Greek, it is here given specifically Roman colour by applying the language and procedures of Roman divorce (146–8n.).

**142 ‘cur...ardet?’** continuing to put the case for marriage, the interlocutor points to a second instance of an apparently successful union. Bibula is an aristocratic name, Bibulus occurring as a cognomen of the Calpurnii and Publicii (*RE* III 1367–8, xxiii 1897–9). ‘Sertorius’ might be a reminiscence of the homonymous *cunnilingus* in Martial (2.84.3): the act was thought connotative of female domination (Mart. 9.80 with W–W), which fits Sertorius’ situation.

**143 si uerum excutias** ‘should you examine the facts’. ‘The metaphor is taken from shaking out any receptacle... to get what is inside; the phrase is elliptical for *si rem excutias et uerum inuenias*’ Duff.

**144–5 subeant...laxet | fiant:** a jussive subjunctive is often substituted, as here, for a *si* clause in the protasis of a conditional sentence. Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.16.54 *sit spes fallendi, miscebis sacra profanis* with Mayer, Kroll 1925: 79.

**144 subeant:** combines the senses ‘supervene’ upon her previously unblemished complexion (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.8.3 *iam subeunt anni fragiles et inertior aetas*) and ‘sink beneath’ the surface of her skin i.e. impress themselves

upon her face (cf. Plin. *HN* 24.46 *aquam quae subit cutem*). The wrinkles that disfigure the countenance are a well-worn topic, closely associated with mockery of elderly women (*Vetula-Skoptik*). In such contexts, however, these are typically in great profusion (e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 1051 ‘what countless wrinkles she has upon her face!’, Mart. 3.93.4). Here the nugatory *tres* underscores the point that, as soon as the tiniest signs of age appear, Bibula is cast off. In contrast to this, in what follows Bibula is transformed into an elderly woman (see following n., 145 n., *et saepe emungeris* 147 n.; cf. Nadeau *ad loc.*). **et se cutis arida laxet** ‘and should her skin slacken and become dry’, leading to wrinkles: cf. Claud. *In Eutrop.* 1.110–11 *aeuo laxata cutis, sulcisque genarum | corruerat passa facies rugosior uua*, Ov. *Ars* 3.73. *arida* (proleptic) denotes the dried-up flesh of age, which has lost the firmness and fullness of youth, τὸ σφριγᾶν (Eur. *Andr.* 196, Achaeus, *TGF* 4.1–3 Snell).

**145 fiant obscuri dentes:** ‘blackened’ (*obscuri*) teeth are a stock theme of abuse, again closely associated with *Vetula-Skoptik*: cf. Mart. 5.43.1, Hor. *Epod.* 8.3 *cum sit tibi dens ater* with Watson’s n. for the opposite, a gleaming smile, as a mark of beauty. **oculique minores:** sagging skin around the eyelids, caused by ageing, makes the eyes appear smaller. Large eyes were regarded as attractive (Hesych. s.v. βοῶπις: ‘with big eyes, with attractive eyes’, SHA *Max.* 3.6 *oculorum magnitudine et candore inter omnes excelleret*, Griffith 1996). So appreciated was ocular beauty that eyes were regarded as the seat of love (Philostr. *Ep.* 56 ‘she was captured [erotically] by the eyes of beauty (κάλλους ὀμμασι)’, Davies 1980, Walker 1992).

**146–8** suggests in various ways Roman divorce-procedure: (1) *collige sarcinulas* is a bastardised version of the divorce formula *tuas res tibi habeto*, hallowed by tradition, if not legally mandatory; (2) *dicet libertus* reflects the practice whereby the *coniunx* initiating the divorce sent a freedman to announce his intention to the other party (*Dig.* 24.2.9, Mayer 1983); (3) *exi* 146–7 is one of a number of more or less colourful words prefaced by *e/ex* which are used of throwing the wife out of the marital home, it being usual for the wife rather than the husband to leave; (4) by the time of Cicero, either party to a marriage could divorce the other unilaterally, on cessation of so-called *affectio maritalis* – as the husband does here. See Treggiari, *RM* 435–82 and 1991.

**146 sarcinulas:** a contemptuous diminutive referring to *movable* goods and chattels, it carries the implication that Bibula’s stay in Sertorius’ household would not be permanent.

**147 iam:** Duff takes *iam* closely with *gravis* in the intensifying sense of ‘quite’, but the adverb more likely has its usual temporal force, ‘you are *gravis* to me now’ (as you were not before your looks started to deteriorate). **gravis...nobis** ‘tedious to me’. *nobis* refers not, with Courtney, to

the *libertus* of 146, but to the husband, whose deeply unpleasant words the *libertus* relays verbatim. **et saepe emungeris:** *emungeris* is a middle. There are two reasons for Sertorius' complaint. First, wiping one nose frequently – with the fingers (W–W 340) – is aesthetically unattractive (Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.80). Second and more important, it is one more sign of old age: cf. Men. fr. 383 K–A 'a snotty old man', Plaut. *Epid.* 494, Juv. 10.199 *madidique infantia nasi*, also Callahan 1964.

**147–8 *exi* | *ocius et propera*** 'get out and be quick about it'. The brusqueness of the phrase (cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 312, *Persa* 772) as well as the repetition of *exi* from 146 emphasise Sertorius' eagerness to be rid of Bibula and replace her with a younger model (*sicco uenit altera naso*).

**149 *interea calet et regnat*** 'meanwhile she is all in favour and lords it'. *calere* is the reverse of *frigere*, 'to be received coldly, slighted'. The primary frame of reference for *regnare* is the elegiac *puella*, whose beauty is standardly said to grant her *regnum* over her lover (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.17.11 *non, tibi si facies nimium dat in omnia regni* with McKeown), but also in play is the warning that beauty can breed a tyrannical disposition in a wife (142–60n.).

**149–50 *poscitque maritum* | *pastores et ouem Canusinam*:** she requires her husband to buy her a sheep farm (*ouem* is collective singular) at Canusium in Apulia, an area renowned for the quality of its wool (Varro, *Ling.* 9.39, Plin. *HN* 8.190). Since Canusian wool was a *de luxe* item (Mart. 9.22.9, Suet. *Ner.* 30.3, Ath. 97e), the purchase of such an estate would, like the other items in lines 150–8, be distinctly costly.

**150 *ulmosque Falernas*:** shorthand for 'the purchase of a Falernian vineyard': elms were favoured for supporting vines (White 1970: 236). The *ager Falernus*, in the coastal area of north-west Campania, produced Falernian, long reckoned among the very best of Italian wines (Plin. *HN* 14.62) and a symbol of wealth and luxury (Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.43–4). The purchase of a vineyard there would be very expensive. See further Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 4.13.

**151 *pueros omnes, ergastula tota*:** as with every other item in 150–8, the slaves and the *ergastula* are purchased at the wife's behest. This interpretation seems preferable to the one usually adopted by commentators – that in reference to 150 *poscit* signifies 'she demands of her husband [that he buy]' the items there detailed, but in reference to 151 means that she requires her husband to make over to her the *pueros omnes, ergastula tota* which he already owns. The slippage in the meaning of the verb, on this reading, is distinctly uncomfortable and in any case, why should the wife ask her husband to hand over to her what he owns? As his wife she would



have *de facto* use of these anyway (Treggiari, *RM* 369). Moreover, it was strictly speaking prohibited under the law for husbands and wives to make gifts to each other (*Dig.* 24.1.1, Treggiari, *RM* 366–71). **pueros omnes** ‘slaves of all kinds’ (cf. *OLD* *omnis* 7a) but *pueri* (contrasted with *ergastula*, referring to rural slaves) suggests in particular slaves of the more luxurious kind, who would have been *empticii*: cf. Harris 1980: 120. **ergastula tota** ‘whole chain-gangs’. As elsewhere (Sen. *Controv.* 10.4.18, Apul. *Apol.* 47), the noun refers to the inhabitants of the *ergastulum*, an agricultural prison where delinquent slaves (but also, apparently, the specialised *uinitores*) were confined overnight, working the fields in chains by day (Étienne 1974, Fitzgibbon 1976). Bibula’s request for ‘whole chain gangs’ stands for the purchase of large estates which these will work: when an agricultural property was sold, the farm-slaves might be included in the sale (*Dig.* 21.1.32, 33, Buckland 1908: 59). *ergastula* are associated with *latifundia* (huge estates) and possession of great wealth (Columella, *Rust.* 1.3.12, Plin. *HN* 18.18–21, Sen. *Ben.* 7.10.5, Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 8.3). Hence the procuring of *tota ergastula* would entail enormous expense.

**152 quodque domi non est... ematur**: the focus now shifts from the large-scale purchases of 150–1 to smaller items for domestic and personal use, which nonetheless remain very costly. *quodque domi non est* means ‘what is not in stock’ (see Fordyce on Catull. 31.14 with bibliography there cited) and accordingly must be bought. **sed habet uicinus**: keeping up with the Joneses. Accusative *quod* should be supplied as object of *habet* from nominative *quodque*.

**153–4** During the Saturnalia festival in December (*mense... brumae*, D’Agostini 1969), traders selling Saturnalian gifts erected canvas booths (*casa candida*) in the Saepta (part of the Campus Martius), which was surrounded by colonnades, including the so-called *porticus Argonautarum*, named for the frescoes of Jason and the Argonauts which originally adorned it (Dio Cass. 53.27.1) but seem later to have been replaced by sculptures depicting these (Richardson s.v. ‘Saepta Iulia’). The booths covered up (*clausus, obstabat*) the Argonautic scenes. Saturnalian gifts could be costly: even by Ovid’s day (*Ars* 1.407–8) the original cheap clay statuettes, *sigilla*, were being replaced by more expensive items: cf. Suet. *Aug.* 75, Stat. *Silv.* 4.9, Lucian, *Saturnalia* 14–16, Leary 2001: 6–8. Hence the purchase at the Saturnalian markets (155–8) of costly *crystallina*, *murrina* and a prestigious ring. See further Schol. *ad loc.*, *LTUR* IV 118–19 and, for a slightly different view of the topography, Ackroyd 1996.

**153 mercator Iason**: so named because of the merchants who populate the vicinity of the *porticus Argonautarum* during the Saturnalian fair. Also a typically Juvenalian debunking of the Argonautic myth (cf. 1.10–11): the

expedition was a mere trading venture, a sneer for which there is some early, if tenuous evidence (Braund 1994: 16). In similar fashion ‘the Argonauts are degraded to *nautae* (not a word of praise), though they are *armati*, i.e. unlike ordinary sailors’ Courtney.

**155 grandia...crystallina:** *crystallina* are vessels made of rock-crystal, *crystallus* (never of glass, *pace* Trowbridge 1930: 79–83). Commanding huge prices (Plin. *HN* 37.29), their costliness enhanced by their fragility (Sen. *Ben.* 7.9.3, Plin. *HN* 33.5), they symbolise useless but expensive luxury (Sen. *Ep.* 119.3, 123.7, Mart. 12.74). *crystallina* could come in very large sizes (cf. *grandia*), states Pliny, *HN* 37.27, who adds (28) that their value was contingent upon their weight: hence the larger the vessel, the greater its cost. **tolluntur** ‘are carried off’ sc. by Bibula.

**155–6 maxima...| murrina:** myrrhine ware (*murrina*, *uasa murrina*), made of fluorspar and often mentioned in the same breath as *crystallina*, was, like it, hugely expensive (Plin. *HN* 37.18–22, Sen. *Ben.* 7.9.3, Mart. 3.26.2). *murrina* were generally not large (Plin. *HN* 37.21): those of the maximum size (*maxima*) would naturally be the most costly. Myrrhine vessels were valued for their variegated colours and their smell (Plin. *HN* 37.22). See further Loewental and Harden 1949, Bromehead 1952, Whittick 1952.

**156 adamas:** a diamond ring, another enormously expensive item (Plin. *HN* 37.55 *maximum in rebus humanis, non solum inter gemmas, pretium habet adamas, diu non nisi regibus et iis admodum paucis cognitus*) and more likely still to be so if once owned by Beronice (foll. nn.), who was known for her wealth (Tac. *Hist.* 2.81, Joseph. *AJ* 20.146). Barb 1969 suggests that *adamas* is derived from a Semitic root meaning ‘red’ and originally signified haematite (Gk. *haema*, ‘blood’), but by a false etymology ἄδραμος (‘unable to be subdued’) came to mean diamond once these became known and their ‘invulnerable’ hardness (Plin. *HN* 37.57, 59) passed into common knowledge. **notissimus...Beronices:** the ‘notoriety’ of the ring stemmed from the unpopular presence of the Jewish princess Beronice in Rome during AD 75–9 as mistress of the future emperor Titus (Dio Cass. 65.15.4), as well as a second brief return to the city following Titus’ accession: cf. Crook 1951, Braund 1984. Romans had a tradition of hostility to relationships with foreign queens (Braund 123 n. 11) and Beronice was ‘Cleopatra in little’ (Crook 163).

**156–7 Beronices | in digito factus pretiosior:** the ring’s value was increased by having been previously worn by Beronice, as happened with artefacts boasting a pedigree of distinguished owners: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.21, Mart. 8.6, Juv. 12.47, Sen. *De tranq. anim.* 1.7, who contrasts an inexpensive table with one *per multas dominorum elegantium successiones ciuitati nota*, Chevallier

1991: 109–11. The idea is not found elsewhere of a ring (though we hear of a number with famous owners: Plin. *HN* 37.3–6, 81–2): the closest parallel is Cleopatra's pearls, which supposedly belonged to the wife of the pretender Titus (SHA *Tyr. trig.* 32.6). In 2011, a huge pearl once owned by Elizabeth Taylor sold at auction for US\$11.84 million.

**157–8 hunc dedit...|...sorori:** widowed for the second time at twenty-two, Beronice remained single, while presiding over the court of her brother Agrippa, who never married, which led to suspicions of incest (Joseph. *AJ* 20.145–6). J. accepts these rumours as fact, the juxtaposition *barbarus incestae* pointedly implying that such antics were only to be expected from Easterners. It is true that there is considerable (if very contentious) evidence for sexual intercourse and marriage between siblings, especially at the regal level, in Rome's Eastern provinces: e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 2.3 *sociatis more externo in matrimonium regnumque*, see Watson 2006: 42 n. 44 (also Huebner 2007 for cautionary remarks). It is likewise the case that Beronice had before her the precedent of queen Helena of Adiabene, who was still living in Jerusalem and had been married to her brother when she was already a professing Jewess (Jordan 1974: 111). But sexual relations between siblings were profoundly contrary to Jewish practice (Philo Judaeus, *On the special laws* 3.22–5). Also Josephus, who at *AJ* 20.145–6, despite palpable hostility to Beronice, is distrustful of the incest rumours, is elsewhere at pains to depict Beronice as a zealous Jewess (*BJ* 2.309–14). Finally, Tacitus, Suetonius and the Suda, who all speak of Titus' love for Beronice, have nothing to say of the alleged incest. All in all, scepticism seems in order. But it suits J.'s chauvinistic and anti-Jewish persona to believe in the scandal. See further Macurdy 1935, Williams 2005: 198 n. 3.

**157 hunc dedit:** Jordan 1974: 110 and 134 states that the ring was given by Agrippa on the occasion of Beronice's (third) marriage to Polemo king of Cilicia, but produces no evidence.

**158 barbarus:** for the term applied to Jews see Cic. *Flac.* 67, Tac. *Hist.* 5.2. The disparaging appellation, often underlined as here by another pejorative term (*incestae*), sets up a polar opposition between the values of the race so stigmatised and those of the civilisation doing the labelling (Dauge 1981: 393–412). And indeed incest was seen as quintessentially un-Roman (Watson 2006). **gestare:** Housman's celebrated emendation of *dedit hunc*, a pointless repetition of *hunc dedit* 157 (see Nisbet 1995: 19). *gestare* is used of wearing rings and the infinitive after *dedit* is unexceptionable (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 12.211).

**159 obseruant...mero pede sabbata reges** 'where barefooted kings keep the Sabbath as their festal day'. The allusion is obscure and none of the

various explanations offered seems satisfactory (see below). We incline to believe with Williams 2005: 201 that we are dealing with an inaccurate representation of Jewish customs, 'by no means uncommon in Latin literature generally and in Juvenal specifically'.

The custom involving bare feet has been taken as referring to (1) the requirement to take off one's shoes when approaching the Temple Mount in Jerusalem (Landauer ap. Friedländer, *Stern* 1980: 100); (2) the prohibition on wearing leather shoes on the Day of Atonement, Yom Kippur, the so called 'Sabbath of Sabbaths' (Lewy 1929: 390–1 and (tentatively) Feldman 1993: 164); (3) the fact that Hasmonean kings assumed the high priesthood for themselves and hence went barefoot in the Temple, as mandated for priests (Feldman). But the reference to the Temple Mount (1) is too specific for the context, and applies to all Jews, not just kings; likewise the second explanation is much too specific to account for *reges* and *sabbata*, which surely refers (foll. n.) to the ordinary sabbath. Finally, the Hasmonean dynasty effectively ended in 63 BC, whereas J. speaks of the present (*obseruant*) and, as with the other explanations, *sabbata* remains unaccounted for. Two further suggestions may also be dismissed: (4) the allusion is to an occasion when Beronice went barefoot before the Roman governor in Jerusalem because she chanced to be fulfilling a vow which required unshod feet (Hild 1885: 189; cf. Joseph. *BJ* 2.313–14). But it is difficult to align the singular Beronice with plural *reges*, or a particular event with the *typical* practice of which J. speaks. (5) Nisbet's emendation *udo* ('a facetious reference to ritual foot-washing would be in Juvenal's manner') – floated in Nisbet 1962: 235, but withdrawn in Nisbet 1995: 259. **obseruant...festa...sabbata**: the Sabbath, from Hebrew 'shabbat', derived from the verb 'shavat' = 'cease from work, rest', conceptually inspired by God's resting on the seventh day after the Creation, was one of the most frequently noticed features of Jewish customs in the Roman world (e.g. Ov. *Ars* 1.76 *cultaque Iudaeo septima sacra Syro*: cf. Goldenberg 1979, Schäfer 1997: 82–92). J.'s characterisation of the Sabbath, *stricto sensu* a day of rest, as a festal day (cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.416 *culta Palaestino septima festa Syro*) is understandable, if inaccurate: misconceptions abounded in pagan authors about the Sabbath: cf. Schäfer 1997: 89–90. **mero pede**: an odd expression for 'with bare feet', echoed at Prudent. *Perist.* 6.91 *stabat calce mera* (line 90 refers to removal of shoes).

**160 et uetus...porcis**: the section ends with a sneer against what was singled out as the most distinctive of Jewish usages, abstention from pork. This was a puzzle to the Romans, who valued the meat – whence various pseudo-ethnographic rationalisations and gibes (Schäfer 1997: 69–81) – though in fact prohibitions on eating various foodstuffs were widespread throughout the Near East (Schäfer 70, Feldman 1993: 168). J.'s mocking

account of the ban on pork (cf. *Sat.* 14.98–9) fosters an implication that Jews are scrupulous about observing ritual purity in trivial matters, while taking a cavalier attitude to important things like incest. **uetus** ‘of long standing’; cf. Schäfer 1997: 66 for the antiquity of the practice. **senibus**: proleptic, ‘so that they grow old’.

**161–83** ‘Of all the women in Rome, does none seem to you suitable?’ Even a woman possessed of all the virtues – supposing one existed – would be unbearable precisely because of her perfection. I would rather have any ordinary woman than the likes of Cornelia mother of the Gracchi, or a Niobe, with their insufferable arrogance.

J. touches here on the third and last of the canonically misconceived reasons for marrying (38–81n.), blue blood. In focusing particularly on the *superbia* of such women (167–83), J. replicates the cautions of writings on marriage: cf. Antipater, *On living with a wife* 3.254 von Arnim ‘the arrogance of noble birth’, Plut. *Amat.* 753C the aristocratic female is ‘proud because of her birth’, Watson 2008a: 278. And despite the existence of arguments contending that high-born women need not prove so (ibid.), for J., their arrogance is simply a given. The passage is important for our understanding of J.’s parodic persona. If his arguments against marriage were meant to be taken seriously, mention of the Sabine women and Cornelia, traditional exemplars of matronly virtue, should have provided an excellent opportunity to make his case convincing. That is, he could have admitted the perfection of the Sabinae and Cornelia, but lamented that no woman like them exists in his own day. Instead, the argument is undermined by presenting even these paragons in an unattractive manner: particularly shocking in the case of Cornelia, to whom is attributed an insupportable pride. The effect is enhanced by choosing as a mythological parallel Niobe, an ideal *matrona* in her fertility and nobility, but a byword for hubristic conceit. No woman will satisfy this misogynist.

**161** ‘**nullane de tantis gregibus tibi digna uidetur?**’ cf. 60–1 *femina uoto | digna tuo*. *grex* is a somewhat contemptuous term (Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.9 with N–H). The Speaker puts in the mouth of his interlocutor a derogatory appellation which he himself might use.

**162** **sit formosa, decens, diues, fecunda**: as a response to the question of 161, this should be a list of the desirable qualities looked for in a *potential* wife (for a similar inventory cf. Plut. *Prae. Coniug.* 141a, Tac. *Ann.* 14.1). But fecundity in particular is a merit of wives, not brides, and the catalogue form of 162 is distinctly reminiscent of epitaphs for *matronae*, which often list their virtues, e.g. *CLE* 237 *hic sita est Amydone Marci optima et pulcherrima, | lanifica pia pudica frugi casta domiseda*, *CIL* VI 9693; see Lattimore 1962: 295–9. Line 162 also resembles a maternal epitaph in attributing to the woman all possible virtues (a rarity in reality: Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap.

Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 313c). The focus on wives here is part of a larger pattern detectable throughout the first section of the Satire, wherein J. oscillates between descriptions of potential and actual spouses, which serves to link the two, the behaviour of *matronae* operating as a warning about what the bride will inevitably become. **formonsa** ‘good-looking’. Beauty is sometimes mentioned in epitaphs e.g. *CLE* 237.1, 1307.6, and was also treasured in a bride, on occasion even heading the list of desirable traits, e.g. Theophr. (cited prev. n.), Tac. *Ann.* 14.1.2, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.85. ‘The choice between *formonsus* and *formosus* is notoriously difficult’ (Coleman 1977: 39), but *formonsa* (F) is preferable because this orthography is frequent in inscriptions (Broccia 1984–91: 560 s.vv. *forma*, *formosus*), and 162 has an inscriptional feel. **decens** ‘graceful’: cf. *CLE* 843 *casta pudica decens sapiens generosa probata*, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.86. **diues**: not an attribute normally lauded in epitaphs, though it was valued in a bride: see Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.86, Plut. *Cic.* 41.3–4, Treggiari, *RM* 95–100. **fecunda**: given that the object of marriage was the production of children, fertility was one of the most important virtues of a wife (Liv. 42.34.3–4, Tac. *Ann.* 1.41.2 *insigni fecunditate*, *ILS* 8452.18–19 *fecundae tecusae*). And although a bride could not be so described, her potential for bearing children, including her physical fitness and her family’s fertility record, was taken into account (Sor. *Gyn.* 1.34–5, Treggiari, *RM* 101–2).

**162–3 uetustos | porticibus disponat auos**: it was highly desirable for a bride to have noble ancestors, ‘the more numerous, ancient and eminent...the better’: see Treggiari, *RM* 90–4. *porticibus* refers to the peristyle, a porticoed courtyard, *disponat auos* apparently to statues of distinguished forebears displayed there (cf. Juv. 7.126–8, Plin. *HN* 34.17 for such in-house displays of statuary). Whereas during the republic prominent families had put on show the *imagines*, waxen funerary busts, of their ancestors in the *atrium*, as a demonstration of their family’s identity and achievements (Eck 1984: 134, Flower 1996: 185–222, Hales 2003: 46–50), under the principate the *atrium* was largely supplanted in importance by the portico as a place for receiving guests whom it was desirable to impress (Flower 1996: 193–4, Wallace-Hadrill 1997: 239–40).

**163–4 intactior omni | crinibus effusis bellum dirimente Sabina**: to say that the prospective bride is ‘more virginal’ (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 62.1 *intactam adhuc et uirginem*) than any (*OLD* *omnis* 7a) of the Sabine women raped by Romulus and his men, who threw themselves into the middle of the battle to stop the fighting between their fathers and their Roman husbands (next n.), involves an amusing inconsequentiality: the *Sabinae* were not *uirgines intactae* by this stage in the story (see Watson 2012: 14). Alternatively, since in 162 *fecunda* is more properly applied to the *matrona* that the bride will become, it may be that *intactior* refers to marital fidelity, as

at Sen. *Phaed.* 668 *respersa nulla labe et intacta*, for which the Sabine women were renowned (cf. Mart. 1.62.1 *casta nec antiquis cedens Laeuina Sabinis* with Citroni).

**164 crinibus effusis bellum dirimente Sabina:** cf. Liv. 1.13.1 *Sabinae mulieres... crinibus passis scissaque ueste... ausae se inter tela uolantia inferre, ex transuerso impetu facto dirimere infestas acies, dirimere iras*, on which J. seemingly bases himself; but the dishevelment of the hair, a sign of mourning (Petron. 111.2) or strong emotion, here also alludes to the traditionally unkempt appearance of the Sabine women, whose lack of vanity about their personal appearance was a mark of their chastity (cf. *intactor*), an idea memorably spoofed by Ovid in *Medic.* 11–16 and *Am.* 1.8.39–42.

**165 rara auis in terris nigroque simillima cycno:** the second phrase corrects the first: an ideal woman is not merely rare, but non-existent. **rara auis in terris** ‘a bird rarely seen on earth’, a phoenix (Schol.); cf. Pers. 1.46 *haec rara auis est*, Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 315b, in an identical context to here, Otto s.v. *auis* 2. *rarus* is often applied to women on tomb inscriptions (e.g. *CLE* 1508.1 *et quae rara fides toris habetur*). Its use in the present context implies that in reality few lived up to the ideal. **nigroque simillima cycno:** i.e. there is no such creature. The black swan being unknown before the discovery of Australia, the notion that the bird, proverbial for whiteness (Otto s.v. *cycnus* 1), could be coloured black became an example of the impossible: cf. Lucr. 2.824, Ov. *Pont.* 3.3.95–6 *si dubitem, faueas quin his... dictis, | Memnonio cycnos esse colore putem*. The comparison of the ideal woman to a black swan is intentionally ludicrous, the humour being enhanced by the parodic use of the epic pattern adjective / *simillimus* -a / noun (cf. Juv. 8.53, La Penna 1997). For a similarly amusing play with the idea of a black *cycnus* cf. the ‘roasting swan song’ of *Carmina Burana* 130.

**166 cui constant omnia:** in whose case everything adds up, i.e. who is perfect; a metaphor from accounting (*OLD* 10b).

**166–7 malo, | malo:** the emphatic repetition (*anadiplosis, geminatio*) is one of a number of rhetorical devices used by J. to arouse the emotion of his audience and to convey the aggravation of the speaker: cf. Wölfflin 1933. The effect is heightened by enjambment, as in other Juvenalian examples of this figure (Courtney 1980: 42), likewise by the comparative rarity in poetry of gemination of verbs (Wills 1996: 103–6).

**167 Venustinam:** i.e. an ordinary woman. *Venustinam* is Bücheler’s reading for the unmetrical *Venūsinam* of the MSS. *Venustina*, albeit not a common name, occurs three times in *CIL* VI. Braund *ad loc.* suggests that *Venustina*

is a *meretrix* (Venustina deriving from Venus), but J. is contrasting Cornelia, with all her virtues (not just *pudicitia*), with women of less exalted station.

**167–8 Cornelia, mater | Gracchorum:** J. may have in mind a famous statue of Cornelia as ideal mother in the portico of Octavia, which bore the inscription *Cornelia Africani f. [mater] Gracchorum* (*CIL* VI 31610): cf. Plin. *HN* 34.31, Kajava 1989.

**168 Gracchorum:** the famous revolutionary brothers Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, tribunes in 133 and 123–122 BC respectively, two of the three children of Cornelia who survived to adulthood and to whose careers she devoted herself after their father's death. **si...affers:** wealth and social status do not automatically go with an overbearing manner (161–83n.), and J. pays lip-service to this by adding the conditional *si* (168; cf. *quotiens* 180). But the following imperatives *tolle...migra*, show that the Speaker treats the arrogance of aristocratic females as axiomatic. **magnis uirtutibus:** for J., Cornelia encapsulated all the virtues listed in 162–3 (apart from beauty, not a conspicuous element in the tradition). She was rich, gave birth to twelve children (at least according to first-century AD sources), was the daughter of Hannibal's conqueror Scipio Africanus, and, as an *uniuira* who famously refused an offer of marriage from Ptolemy after her husband's death (Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 1.7), was the epitome of *pudicitia*. See further Dixon 2007: 7, 49–59.

**169 grande supercilium** 'great pride' (Plin. *HN* 11.138, *OLD* s.v. *supercilium* 2b), associated with wealth and breeding, was warned against in writings on marriage (161–83n.). In the case of Cornelia, arrogance could feasibly be inferred, her family being given to self-advertisement: the tombs of the Scipios from the third and second centuries BC (cf. Courtney 1995: 40–3, 216–29) elaborate on their triumphs and military achievements, while an *imago* of her father, Cornelius Scipio Africanus, was kept by the family in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus until the Antonine period. **numeras in dote triumphos:** a dowry normally consisted of material possessions; Cornelia includes her family's triumphs in the account (*OLD* s.v. *numero* 7a). Having a family of such distinction should be a plus rather than a negative: Poppaea cited her grandfather's triumphal insignia as one of her attractions as a bride for Nero (Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.1.2). J. implies, however, that Cornelia boastfully flaunts the triumphs. **triumphos:** those of the Scipio family and especially of her father Scipio Africanus, whose triumph at the end of the second Punic war, celebrating his defeat of Carthage and Syphax, was famously magnificent: see Polyb. 16.23, Liv. 30.45.2–5, App. *Pun.* 8.66, Sil. *Pun.* 17.628–46, Dixon 2007: 39.



**170-1 tolle...migra:** cf. 146 *collige sarcinulas...et exi*, 'a travesty of the customary...formula of divorce *tuas res tibi habeto*' (Courtney). J. reduces the defeated Hannibal, Syphax and Carthage to items of baggage which the wife is instructed to take with her on quitting the marital home (*migrare*), her husband having found her family pride insupportable. **Hannibalem...Syphacem | ...Carthagine:** Scipio Africanus' triumph was officially over all three (Liv. 38.46.10). **uictumque Syphacem | in castris:** the capture in 203 of Syphax's camp and the destruction of his army was a turning-point in the war.

**170 tolle tuum:** for the scornfully dismissive alliteration cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.8.66 *tolle tuos tecum, pauper amator, auos*. **Syphacem:** Syphax, king of Numidia and ally of Carthage. After escaping from the attack on his camp, he was subsequently captured and, according to Polybius (see Liv. 30.45.5), led in Scipio's triumphal procession – though Livy (*ibid.* 4) says that Syphax died prior to the triumph. In speaking of *triumphi* and Syphax J. may have in mind here the prominence of the latter in Silius' description of the event (17.629-30).

**171 cum...migra** 'begone, Carthage and all'. *cum* = 'along with' (*OLD* 3c).

**172-7** The juxtaposition of Cornelia with Niobe identifies the former closely with the supreme mythological paradigm of boastful arrogance. In Ovid's account (*Met.* 6.146-312), which J. has in mind, Niobe's rash comparison of her brood of seven boys and seven girls to the mere two offspring of Latona brings down on herself the wrath of the goddess and the complete destruction of her family at the hands of Latona's children Apollo and Artemis. Many of the attributes about which Ovid's Niobe boasts (*Met.* 6.172-83) align her with the *rara avis* of 162-71: her husband's lofty position, her wealth and her beauty, as well as her illustrious ancestry and her fecundity. It is the last two which J. particularly highlights, these being especially pertinent to Cornelia; the parallel between the two women is further strengthened if J. had in mind the attribution to Cornelia of six children of either sex (Plin. *HN* 7.57). The fate of Niobe is treated by J. in a typically amusing fashion: see esp. on 172-3 and 177.

**172-3 'parce... | nil pueri faciunt, ipsam configite matrem':** in Ovid it is Niobe and her last son who cry on the gods for mercy; J. amusingly makes Amphion speak, pleading with Apollo to spare the children but shoot his arrogant wife: like the Speaker, who would divorce Cornelia, Amphion is keen to rid himself of an insufferable woman who brought disaster on her family (the parallel between the two is underlined by the anaphora

of *precor*). Amphion's attitude, Nadeau suggests, amusingly inverts that of Cornelia's husband Tiberius Gracchus, who, according to a well-known tale (Dixon 2007: 5–6), chose the survival of his wife over his own.

**172** *parce, precor, Paeon*: *parce precor* is Ovidian, used by him twelve times, though not in the Niobe story, where her last remaining son, however, cries *parcite* (264). The alliteration, characteristic of the sacral style (De Meo 1986: 144–6), is used with parodic effect, not only because the appeal to spare the children entails a surrogate victim in the shape of the mother, the real villain of the piece (prev. n.), but also because of the spectacular inappropriateness of *Paeon*, a cult-title of Apollo signifying 'healer'. For a similarly amusing use of alliterative 'p', cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.6.3 *plangite pectora pinnis* in the mock-lament for Corinna's dead parrot. **dea**: Artemis, sister of Apollo.

**173** *nil pueri faciunt* 'the children are guilty of no crime'. Cf. *feci* 638, 'I committed the crime', Mart. 9.15.2 with W–W. **ipsam** is emphatic: 'it is the mother that you must shoot'.

**174** *clamat*: cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.299–300 *unam minimamque relinque!* | ... *clamauit* [*Niobe*]. The Ovidian flavour of the episode is emphasised by the choice of *clamare*, which Ovid employs fourteen times to introduce direct speech as opposed to two uses in the *Aeneid*.

**175** *extulit* 'buried': OLD s.v. *effero*<sup>1</sup> 3. In Ovid's account, Niobe does not complete the burial rites for her family, being turned to stone immediately after the death of her last child. By omitting the metamorphosis and turning Niobe into an ordinary woman carrying out her family for burial, J. not only amusingly deflates a character from mythology but also draws a more cogent parallel between Niobe and Cornelia, who, like Niobe, reputedly buried a large number of offspring (Dixon 2007: 7). **greges natorum**: cf. Mart. 6.39.20 *Niobidarum grex* of a nobleman's 'children' sired by his slaves. *grex* is often contemptuous (161 n.), but its primary meaning, a flock of animals, is also relevant, in view of the allusion to the Alban sow (177), whose young Virgil (*Aen.* 8.85) refers to as *grex*. **ipsumque parentem** 'and their father as well'. Reports of Amphion's end vary considerably (Apollod. *Bib.* 3.5.6 with Frazer). In Ovid, Amphion committed suicide after his sons were killed (*Met.* 6.271–2), but according to Hyg. *Fab.* 9 he was shot by Apollo. J. chooses this version to point the disastrous consequences of an unsuitable wife, also to foreshadow the conclusion of the Satire, where the wife's activities are literally fatal to her spouse.

**176** *dum sibi... uidetur* 'for thinking herself' (Braund). *dum*, as often, has a causal or explanatory force: cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.37 *dum haruspicinam ueram*

*esse uultis, physiologiam totam peruertitis. nobilior Latonae gente:* Niobe boasted that she was the daughter of the great Tantalus, whereas Latona was ‘born of someone or other called Coeus’ (Ov. *Met.* 6.172, 185–6). *nobilior* underlines the parallel with Roman nobility, i.e. Cornelia.

**177 eadem** ‘likewise, at the same time’ (*OLD* 8). **scrofa...fecundior alba:** the famous white sow with its thirty young, which foreshadowed the founding of Alba Longa after the same number of years (Virg. *Aen.* 8.42–8, Juv. 12.70–4). Reports of the number of Niobe’s children varied, but in the usual version, adopted by Ovid, she had seven of each sex (cf. Grewing on Mart. 6.39.20). Fecundity is a virtue of the ideal *matrona* (*fecunda* 162n.), but in Niobe’s case is subverted and ridiculed; the agricultural term *scrofa*, ironically incongruous in the heroic setting, puts Niobe on the level of breeding livestock.

**178–9 quae tanti...ut se tibi semper | imputet?** a metaphor from accounting (*OLD* *imputo* 1, Duff on Juv. 5.14), lit. ‘what dignity, what beauty is worth so much that it should always set itself down to your account (*tibi*)?’ i.e. ‘what dignity and beauty could possibly make tolerable your wife’s constantly reminding you of your indebtedness to her on that score?’

**178 grauitas:** a maternal virtue; see e.g. *CLE* 63.4 *grauitatem officio et lanificio praestitei*, *ILS* 8452, Plin. *Ep.* 7.19.4; also σεμνότης at Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 141e. Ideally, however, *grauitas* had to be tempered with *comitas*, ‘affability’: cf. Statius’ description (*Silv.* 5.1.64–6) of Priscilla, an idealised matron, *nec frons triste rigens nimiusque in moribus horror, | sed simplex hilarisque fides et mixta pudori | gratia*, Plut. *Prae. coniug.* cited on *plus aloes*, Treggiari, *RM* 241.

**179–80 huius...rari summique... | ...boni:** a virtuous and beautiful wife, as the feminine *corrupta* 180 shows. The language is philosophical (*summum bonum* *OLD* s.v. *summus* 9d; *uoluptas*: cf. Brown on Lucr. 4.1057), the context decidedly not.

**180 animo corrupta superbo:** the Roman nobility was often accused of *superbia*, arrogance, during the Republic and under the Empire as well (Haffter 1956, Hellegouarc’h 1972: 439–41).

**181 plus aloes quam mellis habet:** aloe, the tart-tasting juice of the aloe plant, stands for bitterness as opposed to sweetness (*mel*). Cf. Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 141f ‘the tartness of the housewife, like that of wine, should be profitable and pleasant – not bitter and poisonous, like that of aloe’. Love is traditionally a combination of bitterness and sweetness; here the former predominates. **autem:** the location of *autem*, a word rarely deployed by the poets, at the end of the line is a deliberately prosaic touch (Morgan 2010: 314–15), bringing the argument back to earth after the mock-elevation of the Niobe episode.

181–2 *deditus*... | *usque adeo* lit. ‘devoted...to the point that’ i.e. ‘so devoted that he...’.

183 *inque diem septenis...horis* ‘for seven hours every day’ i.e. more than half of his waking hours (cf. Dig. 50.16.2), a *dies* having 12 *horae*. *septenis horis* is abl. of duration of time, as often in post-Augustan Latin. For *in* with accusative after a distributive adjective cf. Liv. 22.23.6 *argenti pondo bina et selibras in militem praestaret*, OLD 5a.

184–99 *It may seem a small thing, but nothing is more insufferable than matronae who affect Greek on every conceivable occasion, lovemaking included. Young girls might get away with sexy Greek endearments in the bedroom – not an 85-year-old. Nor should you be using such intimate and arousing language in public. But no matter how seductive your tones, your face is an index of your years.*

J. here draws directly on Mart. 10.68 *cum tibi non Ephesos nec sit Rhodos aut Mitylene, | sed domus in uico, Laelia, Patricio, | deque coloratis numquam lita mater Etruscis, | durus Aricina de regione pater*; | κύριέ μου, μέλι μου, ψυχή μου *congeris usque, | pro pudor! Hersiliae ciuius et Egeriae. | lectulus has uoces, nec lectulus audiat omnis, | sed quem lasciuo strauit amica uiro. | scire cupis quo casta modo matrona loquaris? | numquid, quae crisat, blandior esse potest? | tu licet ediscas totam referasque Corinthon, | non tamen omnino, Laelia, Lais eris.* Many of the epigrammatist’s points are echoed by J.: the complaint that the *matrona* has thrown over her Italian heritage (*Etruscis* M. 3, *Tusca* J. 186) in favour of Greek; the sarcastic quotation of Greek erotic endearments (M. 5, J. 195); the wife’s use of Greek to all and sundry (*usque* M. 5, J. 187, 194–6); the misguided perception that this will make her sexually attractive (M. 11–12, J. 185–6, 198–9); the immodesty of such language (M. 6–10, J. 193–7; *pro pudor!* M. 6 *non...pudicus* J. 193; *blandior* M. 10 *blanda* J. 197); the intimate contexts in which alone such speech is appropriate (M. 7–8, J. 191–6). There are, however, some elaborations and alterations of the Martialian template. J.’s *matrona* uses Greek in all situations (*omnia Graece* 187) and to articulate a whole range of emotions (189–90), not simply to express endearments, as in M. Martial objects to the impropriety of a *casta...matrona* using sexually charged Grecisms (9–10), J. to its immodesty in an old woman (193–4). Borrowing language from another epigram of Martial (6.23.3–4 *tu licet et manibus blandis et uocibus instes, | te contra facies imperiosa tua est*), J. stresses far more explicitly than does Mart. 10.68 the unattractiveness of the *matrona* (*facies tua computat annos* 199). Both Martial and J. are ultimately indebted to Lucil. 88–94 Marx, where Scaevola mocks the Hellenomania of Albucius, which evidently included the affected use of that language, and his self-identification as Greek, in defiance of his Italian heritage. See also intro. 48 n. 266.

**184** *quaedam parua...sed non toleranda maritis*: Plutarch, *Aem.* 5 (cf. *Prae. coniug.* 141b) similarly notes that small and repeated offences on a wife's part (μικρὰ καὶ πυκνὰ προσκρούσματα) can do more to alienate a husband than great and patent faults.

**185–7** The *matrona* imagines that her use of Greek makes her more attractive, *formosa* signifying a charm that goes beyond the merely physical (Fordyce on Catull. 86 intro.). Greek had *sermonis lepor* (Cic. *Flac.* 9) and *gratia sermonis*, according to Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.35, who insists (ibid. 33) that Greek is far more agreeable-sounding than Latin, not least because Latin lacks the *iucundissimas ex Graecis litteras... quibus nullae apud eos dulcius spirant* (27), namely φ and υ, a point which he illustrates (27–8) by comparing the superior euphoniousness of Ζεφύροις to its Latin equivalent: cf. ζῶη καὶ ψυχὴ 195.

**185** *rancidius*, lit. 'rancid', is used metaphorically, like *putidus* and σαπρός, of affectation which is in bad taste, hence 'insufferable'. In this sense it is associated particularly with a contrived manner of speech or verbal style: cf. Pers. 1.33 *rancidulum quiddam balba de nare locutus* with Kissel, Gell. 18.8.1, 18.11.2.

**186** *Tusca*: like *Etruscis* in Mart 10.68.3 (184–99n.), *Tusca* stands for 'Italian', in contrast to the *Graecula* into which the *matrona* mutates. According to one view, the Etruscans were autochthonous (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.26.2), and 'Etruscan' was at one time used as a generic term for the Italian races as a whole, many writers regarding Rome as an Etruscan city (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.29.1–2). **Graecula**: a contemptuous diminutive, 'a Greeklette' (Braund). Not necessarily pejorative per se, *Graeculus* commonly takes a pejorative colour from its context, as at Juv. 3.77–8 *omnia nouit | Graeculus esuriens*. It is often used sarcastically of Romans with pretensions to Greek culture. Cf. Petrochilos 1974: 48–53, Dubuisson 1991: 322–9.

**187** *Sulmonensi*: Sulmo, Ovid's birthplace, was 90 miles from Rome, in the territory of the Paeligni. It first came to notice in the Social War, when it fought on the Italian side against Rome (Ov. *Am.* 3.15.7–10). It lay only 7 miles from Corfinium, the metropolis of the Paeligni, which was proclaimed a common city for all Italians in that campaign, being renamed Italica (Strab. 241) – whence its use here to signify in effect 'Italian'. **Cecropis**: an Athenian woman; Cecrops was a mythical king of the city. In 186 the contrast 'Italian–Greek' is expressed in terms of opposing ethnicities, here in terms of opposing townships. **omnia Graece**: sc. *loquuntur*.

**188** A banal interpolation (possibly under the influence of Cic. *Brut.* 140) which not only interrupts the sequence of thought between 187 and 189, but is beside the point.

**189** They use single-word Greek exclamations, such as ὦμοι (cf. *pauent*), *eu* or *euge* (cf. *gaudia*) and ἀϊᾶ (cf. *curas*) to express a variety of emotions: cf. Biville 1996. The line recalls J.'s satiric programme at 1.85–6.

**190 hoc...effundunt...secreta:** women were frequently accused of uncontrollable loquaciousness (Lucian, *Rhet. praecept.* 23 'you see how women are more talkative [than men]', Schuhmann 1977: 57, Watson 2008a: 274 n. 31) and were thought constitutionally incapable of keeping a secret (Plut. *Brut.* 13). Greek was chosen for disclosure of secrets because it was seen as the language of intimate converse, hence appropriate for discussing highly personal matters: cf. Apul. *Apol.* 78–87 (Pudentilla wrote an *epistula*... *Graecatior* to her son on the delicate matter of her remarriage to Apuleius), Adams 2003: 309–10. **effundunt:** 'indicating thoughtless volubility' Courtney. **quid ultra?** 'what's more'.

**191 concumbunt Graece:** they use Greek endearments during sex: cf. 406. **dones...puellis** 'one might perhaps pardon such language in *puellae*' (*dones* = *condones*). The primary sense of *puellae* is 'young girls', as contrasted with the *uetula* of 192–4, but the term also suggests the meaning 'prostitutes' (127n.). In regard to the former, there are indications that young brides may have used taboo words, first encountered at the *fescennina iocatio* (Varro, *Sat. Men.* 10 Astbury), in the privacy of the marital bedroom: cf. Plaut. fr. 68 L *uirgo sum*; *nondum didici nupta uerba dicere*. As for *meretrices*, sexually arousing language was desirable in these, as it was not, according to the conventional view, in *matronae*: cf. *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 1211.7, W–W 226, 228, Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.795–6.

**192–3 quam sextus et octogensimus annus | pulsat:** we do hear occasionally of Roman women of exceptional longevity (Plin. *HN* 7.158–9, Val. Max. 8.13.6, Parkin 2003: 43–6), but the idea that an 85-year-old is still enjoying a vigorous and vocal sex life is designedly ludicrous.

**193 pulsat:** probably a metaphor from the meaning 'to knock at a door' (*OLD* s.v. 2), i.e. her eighty-sixth year is pressing urgently for admittance. In this context of extreme age and senescent sexuality, it is also relevant that death is often said to *pulsare* at a door (Hor. *Carm.* 1.4.13, Ov. *Tr.* 3.2.23–4) and that *pulsare*, like παίω, is sexual slang for 'bang' (Adams, *LSV* 148). Also possible is the sense 'assail, beat' (*OLD* s.v. 5a).

**193–4 non... | in uetula:** such language is 'immodest' because it reveals an interest in sex that was thought inappropriate in an elderly – never mind

an octogenarian – female, even a married one: cf. Mart. 2.34.3–4 *praestatur cano tanta indulgentia cunno | quem nec casta potest iam decuisse Venus*, 3.93.18–27, Watson 1994. This attitude is grounded partly in a functionalist view of women, which saw as improper any prolongation of sexual activity once the capacity to bear children had ceased: cf. Val. Max. 7.7.4 *nubis effeta . . . neque erubescis ei totum patrimonium addicere, cuius pollincto iam corpori marcidam senectutem tuam substrauisti*, Bremmer 1987.

**194 uetula:** a contemptuous diminutive (Urech 1999: 127–30), often applied by Martial to the disreputable type of the randy older woman (Watson 2003: 388–91), from whom the present specimen differs only in confining her unseasonable sexuality within marriage (cf. *maritis* 184).

**194–5 lascium . . . illud | ζωή και ψυχή:** Mart. 10.68 and Lucr. 4.1160–9 provide confirmation that Greek was used for amatory endearments: cf. Pabón 1939, Adams 2003: 360–2. The expression does not seem particularly suggestive per se, but is made so by the context (*sub lodice*) in which it is used, as also by its association with prostitutes, who employed such language as part of their professional repertoire (Mart. 10.68.7–8). Parallels for the present expressions are hard to find (Dickey 2002: 159–62): ζωή is used as here in literature only once elsewhere (Heliod. *Aeth.* 8.6.4 ζωήν και φῶς και ψυχήν) while ψυχή is rare as an endearment until the late period (but note Theoc. *Id.* 24.8, Machon 223 Gow, Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 692d–e). It is likely, therefore, that we are dealing with Italian or Roman Greek (for comparable instances, see Plaut. *Pseud.* 211, 712 with Willcock): ζωή renders the well-attested (*mea*) *uita* and ψυχή (μου) *anima mea* (N–R on Hor. *Carm.* 3.9.11–12).

**195 modo sub lodice loquendis:** the *relictis* of the MSS is intolerable: something cannot logically be ‘just now left beneath the blanket’ when it is employed *in turba*. Housman, giving a different sense to *modo*, proposed *ferendis* ‘things [only] endurable’. Better is Nisbet’s (1995: 242) *loquendis*, ‘words only to be spoken’.

**195–6 modo . . . | . . . in turba:** it’s bad enough that she employs such bedroom language at her advanced age, but, worse, she actually uses it in public.

**196–7 quod . . . | . . . digitos habet:** erotic language and manual stimulation are often coupled as a means to incite male sexual response (Ov. *Ars* 2.705–6, Mart. 6.22.3, 11.29.1–4, 104.11–12). Here the two are rolled into one in an effect of verbal masturbation. Both activities are associated with prostitutes (language: Prop. 3.10.24, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.11–12, 3.14.25, *Ars* 2.723–4, 3.795–6; stimulation: Ar. *Vesp.* 739, 1343–4, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.73–4). There is thus a clear implication that the *uetula* is behaving like a *meretrix*.

**197** *uox blanda et nequam* ‘so seductive and naughty an utterance’.

**197–8** *ut tamen... | subsidant pinnae* ‘that your feathers may droop’ Richlin, i.e. ‘there’s no call, however, to preen yourself’. A similar metaphor at Juv. 4.69–70.

**198–9** *dicas haec mollius Haemo | quamquam et Carpophoro* ‘though you say these things more seductively than Haemus or Carpophorus’. Haemus (cf. Juv. 3.99 *molli... Haemo*) and Carpophorus are actors. *mollius* alludes both to the supposed effeminacy of *histriones* and to the sexual allure which, despite, or rather because of, such *mollitia*, they possessed for women and men alike: cf. Leppin 1992: 108–19, Edwards 1993: 81–4, 1997: 79–80; 63–4nn.

**199** *facies tua computat annos*: her face is one of the primary attributes of a beautiful young female (Tib. 1.5.43, Ov. *Am.* 2.5.47, 3.11.47). Conversely here the woman’s face ‘calculates’ her years, a striking personification to express the idea that the signs of old age are stamped upon her visage, negating her sexy talk. Cf. Mart. 6.23.3–4 (184–99n.).

**200–30** *If you are not going to love your wife, it is pointless to marry and put yourself to the expense of doing so. If, on the other hand, you are besotted with her, prepare for domestic tyranny. She will control all your expenditure, choose who you can be friends with, even dictate the beneficiaries of your will. She will capriciously demand the crucifixion of a slave and your protests will be brusquely overruled. But before long she will leave the house where she dominates for another – and will then return to the bed she has so recently quit. The result of such marital leapfrog? Eight husbands in five years.*

In this section, J. posits and rejects a further possible reason for marrying – *amor* (see 201–2n.). The theme is explored in the form of a rhetorical *dilemma* (Lausberg §393), in which two mutually exclusive alternatives are ventilated: either one does not love one’s wife, making marriage to her a futile and costly exercise; or, if one does, she exploits that affection by forcing her husband to submit to her in everything. The opening statement, that there is no point in marrying unless you are going to love your intended, seems to concede that love should be a component of marriage. But J. then proceeds to nullify this idea in the second half of the antithesis by dwelling on the ways in which the wife whose husband is in love with her will exploit this to the hilt.

In the second part of the section, J. addresses at some length a theme which has already been given an extensive airing, that marriage means wifely *dominatio*: an idea up to this point focalised primarily through the tyranny of the *uxor dotata* or the woman who relies on her sexual allure to rule the domestic roost. Here, however, marriage is equated per se with the disappearance of masculine autonomy, a routine complaint (e.g. Alexis,



fr. 264 K–A, [Hippon.] ap. Stob. 4.547, Men. fr. 374 K–A, Democr. fr. 111 D–K, Juv. 6.30, 43), but developed here (208–24) with a wealth of circumstantial detail, including the enforced naming of the wife’s lovers in her husband’s will and, particularly shocking, a capricious demand for execution of a slave.

**200 legitimis...tabellis:** the marriage contract (*tabulae nuptiales* or *tabulae dotales*), a document sealed at the wedding ceremony by witnesses (cf. Juv. 2.119), which, although not a necessary legal condition for marriage, seems to have functioned in effect as legal proof that a marriage had taken place (*legitimis*). Cf. Treggiari, *RM* 165, Hersch 2010a: 123–31. **pactam:** the term *pacta* (used only of women) properly means ‘promised’, referring to the agreement made before the formal engagement, but is often, as here, equivalent to *sponsa*, ‘betrothed’: see Treggiari, *RM* 139–40.

**201–2 non es amaturus... | causa:** although the lead phrase *si... | non es amaturus* might seem to downplay the likelihood of such a contingency, J. implicitly allows here for the possibility of love within marriage (cf. 10.241–2 *amatae | coniugis*), an idea widely attested, e.g. Philemon and Baucis in Ov. *Met.* 8, Themistius, *On the soul* (Stob. 4.530) and the language of deep affection which – albeit conventional – Ovid, Cicero and the Younger Pliny employ in epistles to their spouses. Cf. Rudd 1981, Treggiari, *RM* 119–22, 253–61.

**201 ducendi:** sc. *uxorem*. The generic term for a man marrying, derived from the *domum deductio*, the ‘leading’ of the bride in a procession from her natal home to her new one, though in fact ‘there are no instances recorded of a groom actually leading his bride anywhere during a wedding ceremony’ (Hersch 2010a: 140–4).

**202 cenam:** the wedding feast (Hersch 2010a: 212–13), normally, it seems, paid for by the bride’s family (Plaut. *Aul.* 294–5, *Dig.* 26.7.52, Treggiari, *RM* 161), but here by the groom, the waste of money (*perdas*) being presented from his perspective. **mustacea:** cakes made of lard, cheese, spices and flour moistened with must, *mustum* (Cato, *Agr.* 121), also connected with a wedding at *Anth. Lat.* 199.49 Riese. Cakes were also served at Greek nuptials (Ar. *Pax* 869 with Schol.).

**203 labente officio:** commentators are divided over whether *officio* (which reflects the fact that it was a social duty to attend a wedding, Treggiari, *RM* 162) refers to the wedding ceremony (cf. Suet. *Cal.* 25, *Claud.* 26), or is used collectively in the concrete sense of *officiosi* (cf. Juv. 10.45), in reference to the wedding guests (cf. Suet. *Ner.* 28 and Apul. *Met.* 4.26). In the first case *labente officio* = ‘as the ceremony is coming to an end’, in the second, ‘when the company is ebbing’. But in the latter case *officio* and

*crudis* refer, somewhat awkwardly, to the same group of people, tilting the scales in favour of interpretation (1). **crudis donanda:** lit. ‘which have to be presented to those who are suffering from indigestion’ (*OLD* s.v. *crudus* 3b). The bridgroom has already provided more than enough to fill the guests and, compounding the waste of money, is also obliged to give cakes to these to take away. For *apophoreta* (gifts to take home), often as here in the form of food, see Leary 1996: 9.

**203–4 illud | quod prima pro nocte datur:** Courtney compares διαπαρθένια δῶρα ‘deflowering gifts’, and φθόριον ἔδνον ‘seduction [wedding] gift’, but can offer no Roman parallel for the idea that the bride was materially recompensed for her loss of virginity, except for a late mention, in connection with *dona nuptialia*, of a *praemium pudicitiae*. The idea is, however, perfectly explicable, given the enormous premium that was placed on the bride’s virginity (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 1.14.8, Apul. *Apol.* 92), and the decorous maidenly apprehension which she was expected to display in regard to the *prima nox* (Williams 1958: 18 n. 13, Hersch 2010a: *passim*).

**204 lance:** a large platter, often of silver. *lances* were used, among other things, to hold gifts/rewards of money (e.g. Petron. 97.3); they could also be included as part of the gift: cf. Mart. *Spect.* 31.6 with Coleman. **beata** ‘rich’, ‘expensive’ (*OLD* 3b): a *lanx* was a luxury item; cf. Ov. *Pont.* 3.5.20, Plin. *HN* 33.145, Coleman (ibid.).

**205 DACICVS...auro:** gold coins (*aurei*) issued by Trajan, whose titles Germanicus and Dacicus (usually abbreviated to GER DAC) were frequently engraved (*scripto*) on them: for a particularly good illustration of what J. has in mind see Mattingly 1936: pl. 16 no. 7, which shows the obverse of an *aureus* containing Trajan’s portrait and the letters GERDAC at the top of the inscription. **DACICVS...GERMANICVS:** Nerva took the title Germanicus when he adopted Trajan in AD 97, to commemorate Trajan’s strong governorship of Upper Germany. Trajan bore it throughout his reign and in 104 added the title Dacicus to memorialise his triumph over the Dacians (cf. Mattingly 1936: xxvi). **auro:** the *aureus* (= 25 *denarii*) was the most valuable Roman coin. It is chosen here to emphasise the expense involved, a point already made by *beata* and *lance*: the *lanx* was both of expensive metal (204 n.) and large (Mart. 14.97, Juv. 5.80, Coleman (n. on *lance*) pl. 30).

**206 si tibi simplicitas uxor** ‘if you are single-mindedly dedicated to your wife’ (*OLD* s.v. *simplicitas* 2). *uxorius* describes an excessive fondness for one’s wife (*OLD* 2), which to an ancient was a sign of a reprehensible lack of self-control, as in the case of Pompey: ‘soon, however, Pompey

himself weakly succumbed to his passion for his young wife, devoting himself almost exclusively to her ... and neglecting affairs of the forum' (Plut. *Pomp.* 48.5; cf. Edwards 1993: 85).

**206–7 deditus uni | est animus:** a reversal of the *uniuiratus* ideal: in this marriage it is the *husband* who is 'devoted' to one partner. *dedere* (cf. 181) is a strong term and though not necessarily pejorative per se (cf. Juv. 9.71–2 *ni tibi deditus essem | deuotusque cliens*), it takes on negative associations here when coupled with *uxorius*.

**206 uni:** cf. Prop. 2.1.47–8 *laus in amore mori. laus altera, si datur uno | posse frui* and the elegiac formula *tu mihi sola places* (e.g. [Tib.] 3.19.3, Prop. 2.7.19, Ov. *Ars* 1.42).

**207–8 summitte caput ceruice parata | ferre iugum:** recontextualises to a marital context and applies to a husband the language of Hor. *Carm.* 2.5.1–2 *nondum subacta ferre iugum ualet [Lalage] | ceruice*. For the thought cf. 43. Husband and wife are often said to be 'yoked' together (cf. *coniunx*, 'spouse', ζεύγος, 'married couple', N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.33.11). Here, in a reversal of the submissiveness expected of the Roman wife (Hemelrijk 1999: 32–4), the *iugum* is reserved for the husband, and for him alone. Cf. Men. *Mon.* 282 Jaekel 'yoked in marriage (ζευχθεὶς γάμοισιν) he is no longer free'.

**208 parcat amanti:** cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 177 *quae amanti parcat, eadem sibi parcat parum* (a *lena* addressing her daughter's lover). *amanti* reverses *non es amaturus* 201.

**209–11** Best deleted, with Ribbeck: *igitur ... maritus* is especially problematical. We expect the text to say that, since wives take delight in torturing and despoiling husbands who love them (209–10), 'therefore one who proves (*erit*) a good and desirable husband is far less useful to her [than one who is passionately enamoured of her]', because she cannot so easily exploit him. But what the lines actually say is 'therefore a wife is far less useful to whoever turns out a desirable husband'. This shifts attention away from the wife, the focus of the preceding and following lines, and, worse, leaves up in the air the question 'far less useful *than what?*' The interpolation might have been provoked by the reminiscence in 208 of the *Asinaria*, where *parcat* means 'spare financially' (sc. from the depredations of a *meretrix*), leading to the interpolation of some lines on the financial despoliation of the husband, ideas expressed by *spoliis* (cf. 232 *spoliis ... mariti* with n.) and *utilis*, which should refer, like *utile* 240, to *financial* advantage. Since a lover may be 'spared' in a number of ways by his innamorata, not just financially (Pichon 1966: s.v. *parcere*), there is no difficulty in jumping from 208 direct to 212.

[209 *ardeat ipsa licet*]: lifted from Mart. 8.59.12.

**212–13** The presence of *nihil* (*nil*) and of a term signifying opposition (*inuita, obstante, si nolet*) in each of the three cola underscores powerfully the wife's complete control of the family finances. By contrast, in a good marriage, all property is held in common (Antipater, *On marriage* 3.255 von Arnim, Plut. *Prae. Coniug.* 140d–f), whereas a bad wife 'quarrels [with her husband] over money' (Themistius, *On the soul*, ap. Stob. 4.530).

**214** *haec dabit affectus* 'she'll prescribe who you should feel affection for'. According to theorists of marriage things should be the other way round (510–11n.).

**214–15** *ille excludatur amicus | iam senior*: Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 3.13e similarly complains *non amicum habere possumus [mariti], non sodalem*, while 'Periktione the Pythagorean' (Stob. 4.692) remarks that a bad wife 'hates all who please [her husband]'. See further 510–11n. The jussive subjunctive *excludatur* reports the order given to the husband by the wife.

**215** *iam senior*: for *iam* with expressions denoting age to indicate the time of life which one has reached, see Oakley on Liv. 6.8.2. *cuius barbam tua ianua uidit*: i.e. 'whose admittance to your house as a friend goes back to the time when he was growing his first beard' in his teens, prior to the *barbae depositio*, signifying admission to manhood. Friends of long standing were naturally much valued (Plin. *Ep.* 2.1.9), so the exclusion of such a one at the wife's insistence is quite shocking.

**216–18** Even the meanest members of society enjoy a testamentary freedom which is denied to the husband, whose wife *dictates* to him who shall be his heirs. There is considerable rhetorical exaggeration here. Most *lenones*, 'pimps' (127n.) and *lanistae*, 'trainers of gladiators' will have been *liberti*, a class whose freedom in choosing heirs was limited: unless they had three children, a considerable proportion of their property (if over 100,000 sesterces) went to their patron (Gaius 3.42, on the *lex Papia et Poppaea*). In practice, moreover, ordinary freedmen engaged in trades did not usually make wills, nor is there any evidence for wills made by *lenones* or *lanistae* (Champlin 1991: 50–9). As for gladiators (the subject of reference in *harenae*, literally 'the business of the arena' OLD 3b), they lacked testamentary rights altogether, either because they were of servile status (only Roman citizens could make a will: Champlin 1991: 42) or, in the case of persons of free birth who became gladiators, because they had forfeited all citizen rights.

**216** *lenonibus atque lanistis*: often derisively lumped together (Sen. *Ep.* 87.15 *quod contemptissimo cuique contingere ac turpissimo potest, bonum non*

*est. opes autem et lenoni et lanistae contingunt*, [Quint.] *Decl. min.* 278.8, Juv. 3.156–8).

**217 iuris idem:** a partitive genitive, in effect = *ius idem*: cf. Liv. 25.22.4 *idem negotii P. Cornelio datum*, Woodcock 59.

**218** Adding insult to injury, the wife not only prescribes to her husband (*dictabitur*, the technical term for dictating a will: Nadeau) the beneficiaries of his will, but includes therein ‘more than one’ of his sexual rivals, sc. her lovers (cf. Mart. 3.70.1–2 *moechus es Aufidiaae, qui uir, Scaeuine, fuisti; | riuialis fuerat qui tuus, ille uir est*).

**219–23** An imagined conversation between husband and wife, using the language of formal legal process, in which the wife insists on the crucifixion of a slave, despotically overriding her husband’s objections. Broadly speaking, it was socially and legally unacceptable for masters to execute slaves without a formal judgement before a magistrate (a *lex Petronia* of Tiberian(?) date: Garnsey 1970: 130) forbade condemnation of a slave *ad bestias* in the absence of such a hearing, and Hadrian (SHA *Hadr.* 18.7) extended this provision to all capital cases involving slaves: cf. Buckland 1908: 37, A. Watson 1983: 59–60). But it was difficult for slaves to access such protections and many masters, it seems, simply ignored the law (A. Watson 1983, Bradley 1994: 171–3), evidently the wife’s intention here. To make matters worse, crucifixion, a servile punishment (Hengel 1977: 51–63), was reserved for the most serious crimes (e.g. murder or forgery: Robinson 1981: 228–33). But the *matrona* here demands the slave’s crucifixion on a whim, in fact does not think she needs a reason (*nil fecerit, esto* 222n.) and, faced with the reasoned (and legally sound) protests of her husband, peremptorily overrules him (the sequence of brief, choppy phrases in 219–23 reinforces the sense of summary justice).

**219 pone** ‘erect’ (*OLD* s.v. 2a), used in place of the more common term for setting up a cross, *figo* or its compounds.

**220 supplicium:** as often, of *capital* punishment. **quis detulit? audi** ‘who informed against him? Listen to what he has to say’.

**221** For the sentiment cf. Amm. Marc. 29.2.18 *de uita et spiritu hominis... laturum sententiam diu multumque cunctari oportere*. **longa** ‘too long’ as in the expression *longum est* (*OLD* 12).

**222 o demens:** possibly an ironic inversion of Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.80–3, where a master is styled ‘mad’ for crucifying a slave for licking a dish which he has been told to clear away, one of a number of passages (cf. Lucian, *Prom.* 10, Petron. 53.3) where slaves are crucified, as here, for nugatory reasons. **ita seruus homo est?** the wife picks up *hominis* 221 with the sneer ‘is a slave

really a human being?’ For *ita* expressing incredulity, see *OLD* 12. While in legal terms, a slave was a *res mortalis* (Ulp. *Dig.* 4.4.11.4–5), there developed from the first century AD, under Stoic influence, the idea that slaves were members of a common humanity rather than an inferior species (e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 47.1 ‘*serui sunt. immo homines*, Ben. 3.22.3–4, Juv. 14.16–17) and should accordingly not be treated with cruelty or brutality (Bradley 1994: 132–40). By making the woman indignantly reject the humanness of slaves, J. places her in the worst possible light – opportunistically: the average Roman did not entertain such an enlightened view of slavery (see Bradley 1994: 140–5). **nil fecerit, esto** ‘all right, suppose he has done no wrong’, a jussive perfect subjunctive employed with concessive force (Woodcock 87), combined with *esto* used to waive an objection (*OLD* sum 8b).

**223** The three brief asyndetic cola drive home the wife’s determination to have her way. **sit pro ratione uoluntas** ‘let my wishes be sufficient justification’ (*OLD* ratio 5c). By contrast Naumachius (Stob. 4.571, lines 12–13) advises a prospective bride to be submissive and ‘not to bid [your husband] to do anything at your will’, while *obsequium*, obedience to one’s husband, was a key virtue of a Roman wife (intro. 21).

**224 imperat ergo uiro** ‘that’s how she orders her husband about’ (Braund) both summarises the wifely behaviour of 219–23 and reiterates a key theme of *Satire* 6, that marriage means domestic tyranny. Cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 409 *patiundum est, siquidem me uiro mea uxor imperium exhibet. mox...relinquit* ‘before long she quits her dominion’. The lapse of time involved by *mox* can vary from a few hours to a somewhat more extended period, as here (Rose 1927): cf. Suet. *Aug.* 62.1 *Claudiam, Fulviae ex P. Claudio filiam, duxit uxorem. ac simultate cum Fulvia socru orta* [41–40 BC] *dimisit intactam adhuc et uirginem. mox* [40 BC] *Scriboniam in matrimonium accepit. regna:* 149n.

**225 permutatque domos et flammea conterit:** commentators are divided between (1) ‘keeps changing her [marital] homes (taking *domos* as a genuine plural) and wears out her bridal veil’, by using it in numerous wedding ceremonies and (2) ‘changes her [previous marital] home and treats her bridal veil with contempt’ by her cavalier attitude to the duration of a marriage (*mox* 224, 226–8). The second alternative appears preferable. The primary emphasis in 224–8 is on the wife’s capriciousness in quitting for another a home in which she dominates so completely, and then returning to it in very short order: it is not until 229–30 that the idea of multiple marriages comes fully to the fore. It also seems more natural to treat *domos*, like the other two nouns in 224–5, as poetic plural, and

to refer *permutat*, like the correlated *relinquit*, to a *single* change of domicile. **flammea**: the wedding-veil, most probably orange-yellow, associated with the modesty and chastity expected of a bride: cf. Luc. 2.360–1 *non timidum nuptae leuiter tectura pudorem | lutea demissos uelarunt flammea uoltus*. See further Hersch 2010a: 94–106 on the vexed issue of the *flammeum*'s colour and various explanations of its symbolism. **conterit**: for *conterere*, 'treat contemptuously', cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.85 *reliqua... facile est conterere atque contemnere*, OLD 2c. The bride has no truck with the ideals that the veil implies (prev. n.). **inde**: from her new home.

**226 auolat**: cf. Plut. *Amat.* 752f, wealthy brides are inconstant and 'fly away'. **spreti repetit uestigia lecti** 'makes once more for her imprint in the bed she had spurned'. For an instance of a wife remarrying a husband whom she had divorced see Dig. 24.3.66.5. For *uestigium* of the 'impress' left by a body in the bed shared by a couple see Shackleton Bailey 1956: 81–2. That her traces are still present emphasises the swiftness of her return to her previous home.

**227–8** That the doors of her new husband's home were 'only a short time before adorned' in celebration of his marriage, the bridal awnings 'still hanging there' and the festal foliage 'not yet withered', underscores the indecent haste with which she leaves his *domus* to return to her previous husband.

**227 ornatas...fores**: cf. 79, 51–2nn.

**228 uela**: probably alludes to decorated hangings (or awnings) suspended (*pendentia*) in the bridal chamber: cf. Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 2.320–1 *alii prae-textere ramis | limina et in thalamum cultas extollere uestes*. Duff interprets 'an awning hung over the *uestibulum* or open space between the street and the house door', but cites no evidence.

**229–30 sic crescit numerus... | ...autumnos**: moralists and satirists complain of the frivolity and immorality of women who repeatedly marry and divorce: cf. Sen. *Ben.* 3.16.2–3 *numquid iam ulla repudio erubescit, postquam illustres quaedam ac nobiles feminae non consulum numero, sed maritorum annos suos computant et exeunt matrimonii causa, nubunt repudiū?*, *De tranq. anim.* 12.4, Mart. 6.7 (ten husbands in thirty days). Treggiari 1991: 42–4 sees such accusations of bridal leapfrog as the product more of genre than reality.

**229 fiunt**: 'an arithmetical term; the total is reached' Courtney.

**230 autumnos**: poetic for *annos* (OLD s.v. 1b). **titulo res digna sepulcri** 'an achievement well worth recording in the inscription on your tombstone': a sardonic inversion of the ideal of marriage to one man of which

*uniuira* routinely boast in funerary inscriptions (cf. Williams 1958: 23–4). For serial marriages thus recorded cf. Mart. 9.15.

**231–41** *There can be no hope of a harmonious marriage if your mother-in law is alive. She instructs her daughter in predatory, adulterous ways and forwards her extramarital affairs. You can hardly expect an immoral mother not to bring up her daughter to be like herself; besides, this serves her financial advantage.*

J. depicts the mother-in-law as a particular danger to the success of a marriage. Her behaviour is a travesty of the expected function of the mother as mentor and rôle model to her daughter (for which see Hallett 1984: 259–62, Dixon 1988: 217–20). The point is made vividly by giving the *socrus* traits of the New Comic *meretrix* who teaches her trade to her daughter (e.g. Melaenis in Plautus' *Cistellaria* and Cleareta in the *Asinaria*, Lucian, *Dial. Mer.* 3, 6 and 7) and of the (closely related) elegiac *lena* who instructs a *puella* in the rapacious ways of the *meretrix*: in both cases, to the detriment of her lover, to whom the husband here is assimilated. Like the *socrus*, these characters are avaricious (cf. J. 232), elderly (cf. 241n.) and rely on their pupils for their profit (cf. *utile* 240): cf. Myers 1996. But a still more important elegiac source for J. is Ov. *Ars* 3.611–66, where many of the topoi to which J. here alludes are drawn together, as the *praeceptor* teaches how to deceive a guard (611–58: J. 234–5), conceal love letters (619–30: J. 233–4), get a girlfriend to feign illness (641–2; cf. J. 235–6), and bribe the *custos* (651–8: J. 235). Notably, that section begins *qua uafere eludi possit ratione maritus*, possibly the inspiration for J.'s focus on the husband here. See further Watson 2007a: 635–7.

**231** *salua...socru* 'while your mother-in-law is still alive' (*OLD* s.v. *saluus* 8a): a rare precursor of modern 'mother-in-law' jokes. The ancient *socrus* had a reputation for being difficult, but such behaviour was normally directed towards a daughter-in-law: e.g. Ter. *Hec.* 277–8, Plut. *Praeconiug.* 143a–b. *concordia*: 'a close and harmonious partnership based on [mutual] affection and co-operation' (Treggiari, *RM* 252) and the most important ingredient for ensuring a successful marriage (*RM* 251–3, Dixon 1991: 107–9, intro. 20–1, 41).

**232–3** *illa docet... | illa docet*: the verb *docere*, and anaphora in a series of *exempla* are particularly reminiscent of elegiac *erotodidaxis*, e.g. Tib. 1.2.19–23 *illa* [sc. *Venus*] *docet molli furtim derepere lecto*, | *illa pedem nullo ponere posse sono*, | *illa... | ... | nec docet*, cf. Tib. 1.4.17–20, 59, 1.6.9, Ov. *Am.* 1.8.9–10, *Ars* 1.45–6.

**232** *spoliis nudi gaudere mariti*: cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.10.29 *sola uiro mulier spoliis exultat ademptis*, Phaedr. 2.2.1–2 *a feminis utcumque spoliari uiros, | ament amentur, nempe exemplis discimus. nudus* (proleptic) describes being



‘stripped bare’ financially, by the wife’s ‘despoiling’ the husband. For the adjective in a similar context, cf. Mart. 4.28.8 *nudam te statuet tuus Lupercus*.

**233 corruptore:** a seducer of married women, as at Juv. 1.77, Sen. *Ep.* 94.26 *alienarum corruptor uxorum*. **tabellis:** love letters. See 277–8n.

**234 nil rude nec simplex rescribere** ‘to write a reply neither unsophisticated (i.e. untrained in the arts of love) nor artless’; the epithets seem virtually synonymous, as at Ov. *Am.* 2.4.18 *siue rudis, placita es simplicitate tua* (making less likely the alternative explanation of *nec simplex* as ‘not straightforward’ i.e. not saying ‘yes’ or ‘no’ outright). The mother’s instruction is illuminated by Ov. *Ars* 3.475–6: in replying to love letters, *puellae* must not appear either excessively keen or totally off-putting. **rescribere:** used frequently by Ovid in such contexts: cf. 141n.

**234–5 decipit illa | custodes:** a common elegiac theme, reminiscent in particular of Tib. 1.2.15–24, as well as Ovid’s advice to *puellae* at *Ars* 3.611–50.

**235 custodes:** trusted slaves employed to guard women, both by locking potential lovers out of the house and acting as chaperons outdoors (e.g. Ov. *Ars* 3.633–40). There is ample evidence for the guarding of *matronae*, e.g. Mart. 1.73.3–4 (to a husband) *positis custodibus ingens | turba futurorum est*, Juv. 6.030–4, Apul. *Met.* 9.17–21, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.2. intro. Here, however, J. has elegy especially in mind: see previous n. and McKeown 27. **aere domat:** a monetary bribe was the conventional means by which women induced their guards to turn a blind eye to their love affairs: cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.2.39–40, *Ars* 3.651–2.

**235–6 corpore sano | aduocat Archigenen onerosaque pallia iactat:** the mother calls a doctor and pretends to be ill with a fever in order to give her daughter an excuse to come to her house, where (237–8) the lover is waiting concealed from sight (*secretus*). Visiting a sick girlfriend was a ploy used by women bent on adultery: see Ov. *Am.* 2.2.21–2, Mart. 11.7.7, Longus 3.15–16 and especially *Ars* 3.641–2, where Ovid teaches *puellae* to get a girlfriend to feign illness in order to provide an excuse to leave the house and a venue for an assignation. J. takes this further, substituting the girl’s mother for Ovid’s *fallax amica*. The stratagem is both plausible and effective: fevers were endemic to Rome (517–18n.), and sick-visiting an important *officium* (Yardley 1973), even more pressing when a parent was involved (cf. Apul. *Met.* 8.11). J. thus paints the *socrus* in the blackest colours: not only does she connive at her daughter’s adultery but cynically exploits to that end the *pietas* due to her as mother.

**235 corpore sano:** although in good health.

**236 Archigenen:** a well-known contemporary doctor (Courtney on 13.98); the name here stands for *medicum*. **onerosaque pallia iactat:** *pallia* = ‘bedcovers’: cf. Prop. 4.3.31, Ov. *Am.* 1.2.2 *neque in lecto pallia nostra sedent*. Here, the *socrus* tosses them off as if they feel heavy to her, suggesting that she has a fever: cf. Ov. *Her.* 21.169–70 *torrentur febribus artus | et grauius iusto pallia pondus habent*.

**237–8** While the mother is conducting her charade for the benefit of the doctor, the lover waits impatiently in hiding. The concealment of the adulterer, usually from a husband who arrives unexpectedly, rather than, as here, potential witnesses to the affair, is a theme of the mime (42n.) as well as the novel (Apul. *Met.* 9.5–7, 14–28).

**238 impatiensque morae:** cf. *prurigo morae impatiens* 327. **praeputia ducit** ‘draws back his foreskin’, one of a number of ways of describing masturbation (Adams, *LSV* 208–11). A vehicle for sexual humour in differing contexts (Adams 208–9), masturbation is naturally resorted to in response to various erotic stimuli (e.g. Mart. 11.104.13–14 *masturbabantur Phrygii post ostia serui, | Hectoreo quotiens sederat uxor equo*), including as here frustrated excitement at pleasure postponed: cf. Mart. 11.73.3–4.

**239–40 scilicet... | ...habet?** There was an awareness that a mother-in-law’s character was crucial in shaping her daughter’s for good or, as here, for ill (Antipater, *On living with a wife* 3.254 von Arnim, Eur. *Andr.* 229–31, 619–23, Men. *Dysc.* 384–9, Juv. 14.25–30), one instance of a wider sensitivity to the influence of upbringing upon a person’s nature. A corrupt upbringing was a stock theme (e.g. Juv. 14.25–30 for the same situation as here, Plut. *De liberis educandis* 14a–b); conversely, Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1367b33) remarks ‘it is probable that virtuous parents will have virtuous offspring and that a man who has been brought up thus [i.e. virtuously] will turn out so’.

**239 scilicet expectas ut:** the unlikelihood conveyed by *expectas ut* (75n.) is underlined by the sarcastic *scilicet*.

**240 utile:** in terms of the financial exploitation of both husband and lovers. Cf. 231–41n.

**241 filiolum turpi uetulae producere turpem:** summarises and highlights the main theme of the section, the evil influence of mother on daughter. 241, containing two nouns, their epithets and a verb, and enclosed by a noun and adjective, is an instance of a well-known hexametric pattern (Patzner 1955, Pearce 1966), which throws into relief the framing noun and adjective. And its effectiveness is increased by the emphatic positioning of the key term *turpis* at verse-end (reversing the usual pattern

whereby the framing adjective comes at the beginning, its noun at the end). **filiolam** carries several implications: (1) as a true diminutive, it suggests a young bride, who is vulnerable to corruption by her mother (Roman girls, particularly upper-class ones, married early: Hopkins 1965a, Shaw 1987, Lelis *et al.* 2003); (2) as a satiric/depreciatory diminutive, along with *uetulae*, it casts moral aspersions on both mother and daughter, young prostitute and *lena*/ex-whore of advanced years (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.8.111–14, Prop. 4.5.63–70); (3) since prostitutes often affected diminutive names, *filiola* may hint at her new status as marital *meretrix*. **uetulae**: an insulting diminutive, of low register: see intro. 31 and 194n. **turpem**: proleptic, used as often of sexual debasement (O3n.). The application of both *turpis* and diminutives to both mother and daughter underlines the impression of the latter as a miniaturised version of the former.

**242–5** *There is scarcely a legal issue concerning which a woman won't bring a lawsuit. They do not shrink from dictating even to experts how their case should be pleaded.*

In attacking women for litigiousness, J. accuses them, as so often in *Sat.* 6, of encroaching on male preserves: on *femina litem* 242 Ferguson comments 'a juxtaposition of things which ought to be incompatible'. It was widely assumed, on account of their presumptive infirmity of judgment and ignorance of the law, that there was no place for females in legal disputes: cf. Ulp. *Dig.* 11.1 (*de tutelis*) *et propter sexum infirmitatem et propter forensium rerum ignorantiam*, Paul. *Dig.* 22.6.9 *pr.*, Marshall 1990: 47 n. 3, Dixon 2001: 73–88. A very few women did however plead their own cases (Val. Max. 8.3; intro. 44), eliciting the revealing complaint from Valerius that these were undeterred by *condicio naturae et uerecundia stolae* (cf. also *Dig.* 3.1.1.5 quoted intro. 25 n. 143). Significantly, he observes of the first of his three examples, Maesia of Sentinum, [*eam*] *quia sub specie feminae uirilem animum gerebat Androgynen* ('virago') *appellabant*. J.'s female litigators do not proceed to the same extremes (see below), but the underlying objection is the same.

**242–3** The claim 'there is pretty well no case in which a woman wouldn't stir up a lawsuit' is an absurd exaggeration. Women could certainly initiate civil cases, mostly involving disputed wills (Buckland 1963: 328, Gardner 1986: 189), but (with rare exceptions) could not bring criminal cases (Macer, *Dig.* 48.2.8, Jones 1972: 117) and in general suffered a severe limitation of their ability to prosecute others (Mommson 1899: 369). **litem | mouerit**: potential subjunctive, as often in the perfect with present force. *mouere* = 'set in motion' (*OLD* s.v. 17ba). For the expression cf. Ulp. *Dig.* 4.3.33.

**243** *accusat Manilia, si rea non est*: *accusat* means that Manilia *initiates* the prosecution, not that she argues it in court (otherwise there would be no need to dictate to her counsel how he should plead the case, 244–5). For *accusare* in this sense, cf. Tryphoninus, *Dig.* 5.2.22, *Cod. Iust.* 9.9.1. It was normal for a female litigant to employ a male *aduocatus*. Thus Attia Viriola uses Pliny as her advocate in the centumviral court: *femina splendide nata...exheredata ab octogenario patre... bona paterna repetebat* (*Ep.* 6.33.2), where *bona paterna repetebat* carries the same implication as *accusat* here, viz. launching a case as plaintiff. As for *rea*, the term suggests that she faces prosecution on a criminal charge, as in the case of Maesia (242–5n.), who is likewise styled *rea* by Valerius, and it is known that, from the early Empire, women could be tried on such charges either in court or before the senate (Marshall 1990: 50–1). But, as with *accusat*, a male will act on her behalf, as Pliny does for Corellia, against whom a *lis...intenditur* (*Ep.* 4.17, Gardner 1986: 263). Given this, there is no serious contradiction with *Sat.* 2.51–2 *numquid nos [feminae] agimus causas, ciuilia iura | nouimus aut ullo strepitu fora uestra mouemus?*, since Laronia is primarily denying that woman plead cases themselves. **Manilia**: not otherwise known, but her name is aristocratic (Ferguson 1987: 145).

**244** *componunt ipsae...libellos*: the *libelli* are the ‘briefs’ (the statement of the case), which the plaintiff produced (*Quint. Inst.* 12.8.5), with or without professional assistance (*ibid.*). The point of *componunt ipsae per se formantque* is probably not that women presumptuously dabble in legal matters of which they lack knowledge, rather that they have (to the Speaker) an unconscionable level of expertise. *Cic. De or.* 2.142 shows women consulting jurists on points of law, and the numerous rescripts addressed by the Emperor to women in response to their *libelli* demonstrate that the latter had a certain amount of legal knowledge (Marshall 1989: 48–50).

**245** In addition to writing the legal briefs (244), they even dictate the speech to the advocate, as if they had more knowledge than an expert. Rhetoric did not, it seems, form part of the education of Roman females (Hemelrijk 1999: 25), but a few women did exhibit unusual expertise, such as Nero’s last wife Statilia Messalina (*Schol. Juv.* 6.434), as well as Hortensia and Maesia cited by Valerius Maximus (242–5n.): the latter *modosque omnes ac numeros defensionis...diligenter...exsecuta [est]*. As usual the exception is presented as the rule. **principium**: an alternative term for the *exordium* of a speech (*Quint. Inst.* 4.1.1). **locos**: *loci* stands in effect for the substance of the speech. The term has multiple significations in rhetorical parlance: divisions of a speech, ‘purple passages’ and *loci communes*. **Celso**: the context makes it clear that ‘Celsus’ must stand for an expert in oratory and is accordingly Aulus Cornelius Celsus, of the Tiberian era,

who, in addition to his extant *De medicina*, also wrote on rhetoric, rather than one of the Iuuentii Celsi, jurists both, who belonged to the late first and early second century AD.

**246–67** *Everyone knows about women athletes and the gladiatorial activities of matronae. Such women are entirely immodest and transcend the boundaries of their sex – not that they would wish to become men. A fine sight if an auction should contain a range of your wife’s gladiatorial gear! Yet these women, who are chafed by the lightest of female attire, practise their fighting routines and wear heavy gladiatorial armour – until a call of nature reveals that they are women after all. They behave in a way that no gladiator’s woman ever would.*

After a brief initial mention of women athletes, J. devotes the remainder of this section to female gladiators. His primary target is upper-class women who undertake gladiatorial training, with the intention perhaps of appearing in the arena (250–1), in defiance of their social status (259–60n., 265–6: cf. Calp. Flacc. *Decl.* 52 *neque enim condicione gladiatoria quicquam est humilius in uulgo*) and their sex (252–3): the gladiator’s art was quintessentially masculine (Plin. *Pan.* 33.1, Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.53–4 *stat sexus rudis, insciusque ferri | ut pugnas capit improbus uiriles!*). The female gladiator hence constitutes an anomaly that reflects a wider taste for the unusual in the arena (Briquel 1992: 50), which, for example, saw women matched with women, along with contests between dwarfs (Dio Cass. 67.8.4, Brunet 2004). Other references to women appearing as gladiators or *bestiariae* include Dio Cass. 63.3.1 (Ethiopians), Mart. *Spect.* 7 and 8, Suet. *Dom.* 4.1, SHA *Aurel.* 34 and *AE* 1977, 153 (? third century AD: Coleman 2000: 498). A famous inscribed relief from Halicarnassus depicts two visibly female combatants named Amazon and Achillia (Robert 1940: 188–9 no. 184, Dunkle 2008: fig. 22; Coleman 2000 for full discussion). It seems clear that these largely anonymous figures were either slave-women or prisoners of war (Dio Cass. 66.25.1: the women fighting in the newly inaugurated Colosseum were ‘not of any prominence’, Schäfer 2001) and represent the vast majority of female combatants. But J. chooses to focus on the far more exceptional circumstance of high-status women operating as gladiators: a situation which has some basis in reality; cf. Dio Cass. 61.17.3 ‘there was that occasion at once most disgraceful and shocking, when men and women not only of equestrian but also of senatorial status... killed wild beasts and fought as gladiators, some willingly, some very much against their will’ (AD 59) and Tac. *Ann.* 15.32 (AD 63); see also Juv. 1.22–3, Dio Cass. 76.16.1. Further confirmation that high-class females might be tempted to fight in the arena is provided by a *senatus consultum* of AD 19 from Larinum which banned senatorial and equestrian descendants of both genders from participation therein (Levick 1983). As for the training regime undertaken by J.’s *matronae*, this might reflect possible

female involvement in the gladiatorial exercises undertaken in the *collegia iuuenum*, in which bodies it seems girls participated (Vesley 1998).

**246 endromidas Tyrias:** the *endromis* was a thick wrap worn to keep out the cold while working out (rather than donned for that end in the intervals between exercise, as is usually said): so apparently Mart. 4.19, our best source on the garment, and probably in J.'s mind in 246 (*ceroma* M. 5, *Tyria sindone* M. 12). The phrase is a notable oxymoron: the *endromis* cost little (Mart. 14.126.1) but is here dyed with the fantastically expensive Tyrian purple (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.21–2), suggestive of an extravagance which is quite out of place, and underscoring the women's high social status. **femineum ceroma:** i.e. female wrestling (*ceroma* is the clay floor of the wrestling ring, Reinmuth 1967). Another oxymoron: wrestling and other gymnastic pursuits were, despite limited participation by women (Lee 1988: 117 n. 36, K–E fig. 155) essentially masculine activities (Mart. 7.67 with W–W, Dickie 1993: 141–51). J. may also be invoking the common view of gymnastics as an unwholesome Hellenic practice (Luc. 7.270–1, Mart. 7.32, intro. 45), reinforcing this satirically by using the Greek terms *endromis* (cf. Juv. 3.103) and *ceroma*.

**247 quis nescit:** cf. *nota* 314. **uulnera pali:** *uulnera* is ironic, since caused by a *rudis* (248n.). The *palus* is a wooden post set in the ground upon which gladiatorial and military recruits practised sword thrusts and feints, *ut... quasi praesentem aduersarium, sic palum omni impetu, omni bellandi arte temptaret* (Veg. *Mil.* 1.11). Cf. Balsdon 1969: 294, and for a mosaic illustrating such practice, see Golvin and Landes 1990: 156.

**248 quem cauat assiduis rudibus:** the *palus* is whittled away (cf. Plin. *HN* 10.38 *picum arbores cauantem*) by repeated blows from the *rudis*, the wooden sword with which the apprentice gladiator practised cuts and thrusts (*OLD* s.v. *rudis*<sup>2</sup> 2a). **scutoque lacessit** 'assails with her shield', which was used for attack as well as defence: cf. Veg. *Mil.* 1.4 and Junkelmann 2008: 76 (76–81 for a detailed account of the types of shield which were specific to the different classes of gladiator). For *laccio*, 'attack', cf. Virg. *G.* 3.233–4 *uentosque lacessit | ictibus [sc. taurus]*.

**249 omnes implet numeros** 'she goes through all the practice manoeuvres' of the training drill. *numerus*, literally 'rhythm', refers to the rhythmic movements inculcated by the trainer; cf. Veg. *Mil.* 1.4, Duff *ad loc.*

**249–50 dignissima... | ...tuba:** the *matrona*'s training would prepare her admirably for the gladiatorial contests which, according to the Scholiast, were undertaken by *meretrices* at the Floralia (*meretrices... Florilibus ludis armis certabant gladiatoris atque pugnabant*). Seemingly these were sham fights (contrast *uerae... harenae* 251), like the mock *uenationes* which we

know also featured in the Floralia: cf. Ov. *Fast.* 5.371–4, Gnilka 1968b: 199–205. The juxtaposition of *Florali* and *matrona* underscores the shocking idea that a *matrona* might participate in a festival which was closely associated with *meretrices* (cf. next n.).

**250 Florali:** the Floralia, games in honour of the goddess Flora, were held from 28 April to 3 May and were notorious for the prominence of *meretrices*, whose staged performances required them to strip naked: cf. Mart. 1 *praef.* 14–21 with Howell. **tuba:** gladiatorial contests were accompanied by the sound of various musical instruments, including the *tuba*, a long straight trumpet: cf. Wille 1967: 202–3, K–E 65–6, with fig. 65.

**250–1 nisi...|...agitat** ‘unless she is planning something more in that breast of hers’. *nisi si* is a colloquial pleonasm for *nisi* (*OLD* s.v. *nisi* 7a). Nisbet 1999: 225 is attracted by Scholte’s *imo*, presumably because *illo* seems jejune.

**251 ueraeque paratur harenae** ‘is preparing herself (middle) for the real arena’, an unlikely but not impossible situation (246–67n.).

**252 mulier galeata:** as the helmet is the most conspicuous element in the gladiatorial dress, the wearing of one encapsulates the woman’s determination to approximate as far as possible to a male gladiator, thus abandoning the characteristically feminine virtue of *pudor*.

**252–3 quem...|...amat** may be punctuated in three ways: (1) *quem...pudorem, quae fugit a sexu? uires amat*; (2) with a question mark after *pudorem*, followed by *quae fugit a sexu, uires amat*; (3) *quem...pudorem, quae fugit a sexu, uires amat?* (1) appears best. Appended to *mulier galeata, quae fugit a sexu* neatly develops the thought of 252, that the *gladiatrix* has abandoned all claims to modesty and femininity, while *uires amat*, ‘it’s the violence she loves’, is also effective as a stand-alone conclusion, akin to *ferrum est quod amant* 112.

**253–4 haec tamen...|...uoluptas!** A sarcastic aside: despite her rejection of her sex in emulating a gladiator, she would not wish actually to become a man, because the pleasure experienced in intercourse (*uoluptas*) by the male sex (*nostra*) was dwarfed (*quantula*) by the enjoyment felt by females, according to a well-known Hesiodic myth (fr. 275 M–W, Ov. *Met.* 3.316–38).

**255 quale decus** ‘what a fine sight!’ (Braund). *sint* should be understood, to go with the subjects *balteus* etc. **auctio:** an auction of superfluous property, acquired by inheritance (Cic. *Att.* 7.3.9, Plin. *Ep.* 8.18.11) or as here by other means: see Halleran 2012: 252–5. Marcus Antoninus held a public auction to finance a foreign campaign: included were articles from his

wife's wardrobe (SHA *Marc. Antonin.* 17.4–5). Here their place is taken by the *uxor*'s gladiatorial kit.

**256–7 balteus...** | ... **tegimen:** the equipment is that of a *murmillo*: a broad belt of metal (*balteus*), a thickly padded arm guard (*manica*), worn on the right arm, a brimmed helmet, to which a plume (*crista*) of feathers or horsehair could be attached, and a half-greave, fitted over wrappings for the left leg, clearly visible in a gladiator-mosaic from Augst (Augusta Raurica), near Basel: cf. Berger and Joos 1971: 28–30, Junkelmann 2008: illustr. 136. See further K–E 48–51, with figs. 37, 38 and 45 (also Liv. 9.40.3 with Oakley for *ocreae* worn on the left leg).

**257–8 uel...** | **proelia** 'or if she sets in motion a different kind of battle' i.e. if she fights as a different category of gladiator (as a *Thraex* or *hoplomachus*: cf. *ocreas* 258n.).

**258 tu felix** 'lucky you', the adjective, often used to connote marital felicity, being here used ironically (Nadeau). For *felix* used sarcastically cf. also Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.28. **ocreas:** the *Thraex* and the *hoplomachus* wore high greaves on both legs, which were otherwise unprotected due to the small size of their shields (contrast the large shield of the *murmillo*). Cf. K–E 51–7, with figs. 37, 45, 46. **puella:** a term for a young married woman, carrying connotations of husbandly affection which are ironised by the context: cf. P. Watson 1983: 135–6.

**259–60** The very women who wear the armament of the heavyweight gladiatorial categories (cf. K–E 51) find even the flimsiest items of female clothing insupportable, such is their sensitivity (*delicias*).

**259 tenui** effects a contrast with the weight of the gladiatorial gear and simultaneously blackens the woman's character. For a *matrona* to wear thin or diaphanous clothing, the uniform of the prostitute, indicated adultery (Sen. *Controv.* 2.7.exc. *infelices ancillarum greges laborant ut adultera tenui ueste perspicua sit et nihil in corpore uxoris suae plus maritus quam quilibet alienus peregrinusque cognouerit*, Petron. 55.6.15–16, [Lucian,] *Amores* 41, Olson 2008: 14). **cyclade:** a luxury women's outer garment with a decorative border, often of gold, encircling (Gk. *kuklos*, 'circle') its base (Olson 2008: 51). Pace Friedländer, the *cyclas* and the *panniculus bombycinus* are not identical. Suet. *Cal.* 52 *aliquando sericatus et cycladatus* plainly regards the *cyclas* and silken garments as separate.

**260 panniculus bombycinus urit:** silken clothing (*bombyx*, 'silk-worm'), a costly item of female luxury, was a byword for its diaphanous character (Apul. *Met.* 10.31, Smith on Tib. 2.3.53). Moreover, the women's silken garb is the merest scrap of clothing, *panniculus* (diminutive of *pannus*, a



small or inadequate item of apparel (*OLD* s.v. 2a)). Nonetheless it still ‘chafes’.

**261 fremitu:** an unbecoming sound for a woman. Markland suggested *gemitu* as *fremitus* is not often employed of the sounds made by people, except in crowds, but the word is used of a single individual at Acc. 550 Ribb. **monstratos perferat ictus** ‘she executes the thrusts that have been shown to her [by the trainer]’.

**262 et quanto ... curuetur pondere:** gladiatorial helmets found at Pompeii weigh between 3.3 and 6.8 kg., with an average of 4 kg. It has often been thought, partly because of their weight, that these were worn in the procession preceding the contest, rather than in the fight proper, but this has been firmly rebutted by K–E 38–43. For a woman, however, such helmets might well have been excessively heavy.

**262–3 quanta | ... libro** lit. ‘how great the bandage of how thick bark [ablative of description] that sits on her knees’. ‘The wrappings and padded tubes (*fasciae*) for leg protection ... provided a good lining for the heavy greaves [which] otherwise ... would have put very uncomfortable pressure on the unprotected tops of the feet’ K–E 47, with illustr. 37 and 45.

**263 libro:** the more usual material for leg-wrappings was leather or quilted linen (K–E 46–7).

**264 Bathos:** she is a woman after all! The *scaphium* is a chamber pot specifically for use by females (Ar. *Thesm.* 633 with Austin–Olson, Mart. 11.11.6 with Kay, Poll. *Onom.* 10.45), in contrast to the *matella* which Trimalchio has stationed close at hand while exercising (Petron. 27.3–6).

**265–7** An indignant concluding apostrophe. Even gladiators’ women (*ludia*, *uxor* nn.), at the very bottom of the social scale, and with a presumptive interest in *gladiatura*, would not degrade themselves by training for the arena, as do these female descendants (*neptes*) of the most distinguished Roman families (by contrast, when aristocratic men and women were forced under Nero to perform in the Circus and arena, many were ‘most unwilling’, Dio 61.17.4–5).

**265–6 neptes Lepidi ... | ... Fabii:** the Aemilii Lepidi were among the most illustrious Roman families: L. Caecilius Metellus was twice consul, triumphator in 250 BC and dictator in 224; his most famous exploit was to rescue the Palladium from the burning temple of Vesta in 241 BC (Cic. *Scaur.* 48, Juv. 3.138–9), supposedly at the cost of his sight (Sen. *Controu.* 4.2), whence his agnomen *Caecus*. Q. Fabius Maximus Gurgus (J. gives *cognomen* before *nomen*) was consul three times, (?) censor, and enjoyed triumphs over the Samnites, Lucanians and Bruttians. It is ironic, in view of

the degenerate behaviour of his descendants, that Gurges in 295 inflicted punishment on some *matronae* who had been convicted of *stuprum* (Liv. 10.31.9).

**266 ludia:** 104n.

**267 hos habitus:** the gladiatorial gear of 252–8 and 262–4. **gemat:** from the vigour of the exercise (cf. Hor. *Epod.* 5.31, Sen. *Ep.* 56.1). **uxor:** the *contubernalis* of Asylus, evidently a gladiator.

**268–85** *The marital bed is a locus for endless quarrels, not sleep. A wife becomes furiously angry when accusing her husband of consorting with slave boys or another woman. In fact she does so to cloak her own infidelities – as you would see were you to open her writing chest, full of lovers' billets doux. But you are completely gulled by her fake tears, taking them as a proof of love. Suppose, however, she is caught in flagranti delicto. She will simply brazen it out.*

The tactics adopted by the unfaithful wife in 270–8, simulated anger and jealousy, are plausible precisely because they cleverly exploit hostile stereotypes of the female sex: women were thought peculiarly liable to both rages and sexual jealousy. Lucian states 'women have much irascibility in them' (*Abdicatus* 28), Seneca opines *ira muliebre maxime . . . uitium est* (*De ira* 1.20.3; cf. *Clem.* 1.5.5) and there are many essentialising remarks such as Alexis, fr. 150.4–5 K–A 'a dowry is bitter and full of female bile', Men. fr. 636 K–A and Gell. NA 1.17.1 *irarumque et molestiarum muliebrum per diem perque noctem scatebat*: see further Harris 2003. As for sexual jealousy and insecurity, females were likewise seen as especially prone to these. Examples include Eur. *Med.* 265–6, Herod. *Mimiamb.* 5, Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 313d 'cur aspiciebas uicinam?' 'quid cum ancillula loquebaris?' . . . *alterius amorem, suum odium suspicatur*, Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 144c–d and Ov. *Ars* 2.373–8 *sed neque fuluus aper media tam saeuus in ira est . . . nec lea, cum catulis lactantibus ubera praebet . . . femina quam socii deprensa paelice lecti*; where, as in 270, the animal analogies underscore the woman's insensate rage. As for the crocodile tears of 272–7, these are a well-attested female stratagem (cf. Ter. *An.* 558–9, Prop. 3.25.5–6 *nil moueor lacrimis: ista sum captus ab arte: | semper ab insidiis, Cynthia, flere soles*), sometimes enlisted by *demi-mondaines* who use them, like the wife here, to cloak unfaithfulness: cf. Ter. *Eun.* 64–70, Ov. *Am.* 1.8.79–80 and 83–4 *quin etiam ediscant oculi lacrimare coacti, | et faciat udas illa uel illa genas*. Posidipp. *Anth. Pal.* 5.186.1. In 270–5 the wife is accused of launching attacks on her partner in order to divert attention from her own misdeeds. This is another tactic in the war of the sexes: cf. Ter. *Eun.* and Ov. *Am.* cited above, Alexis, fr. 150.8 K–A 'but these [wives], when they wrong us, actually make accusations in addition against us', Lys. 1.12, Aelius Aristides 33.16.

**268–9 semper...|...iacet:** women are often depicted as quarrelsome by nature (Semon. fr. 7.103–5 W, Ar. *Thesm.* 786–8, Muson. 3 (φιλόνηκος)), *lites* being seen as a wifely speciality (Ov. *Ars* 2.155 *dos est uxoriam lites*, Plaut. *Men.* 765–71, Sen. *Brev. vit.* 3.2, Petron. 74.17, Themistius, *On the soul* ap. Stob. 4.530, Liban. *Or.* 26.12, a bride complains about the bed on the nuptial night, the start of a marital ‘war’). See also intro. 29.

**268 semper:** the bad wife is constantly at odds with her husband: cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 318–19 Ly. *quicum litigas, Olympio?* | Ol. *cum eadem qua tu semper*. Ly. *cum uxori mea?*, Men. fr. 219.6 K–A, Plut. *Amat.* 753c (ἀεί). **alternaque iurgia:** according to J., the wife initiates the quarrel, but the recriminations turn mutual: cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.153–5, Sen. *De ira* 3.33.1, Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 138d.

**269 iacet** ‘lies down (for the purpose of sleep)’: OLD s.v. 2b, an idea qualified by the following *minimum dormitur in illo*. **minimum dormitur in illo:** Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 313d explains why: *per totas noctes garrulae conquestiones*. The bed (*illo* sc. *lecto*), instead of a venue for sleeping, becomes the site of quarrels: cf. Sen. *De ira* 3.33.1 *uxorum maritorumque noctes strepunt litibus*, Plaut. *Asin.* 937, *Mostell.* 699–701, Plutarch, *Prae. coniug.* 143e ‘a wife must always and everywhere avoid clashing with her husband and a husband with his wife. It is particularly important to avoid doing this in resting and sleeping together...for disputes, abusive remarks and outbursts of anger bred in bed cannot be easily resolved in another time and place.’

**270 grauis...uiro** ‘oppressive’, possibly with a glance at the oft-repeated complaint that wives are a βάρος or φορτίον, ‘burden’, to their husbands (Antipater, *On marriage* 3.256 von Arnim, Stob. 4.516, 521, Men. *Sent.* 459 Jaekel, Buddenhagen 1918: 18–19).

**270–1 tunc orba tigride peior, | cum simulat gemitus:** the ferocity of tigresses robbed by hunters of their cubs (*orba* sc. *catulis*) was proverbial in both literature (Plin. *HN* 8.66, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 3.263–8) and art (Toynbee 1973: pls. 23 and 24), often lending itself to comparisons as here: cf. Sen. *Med.* 862–5, *HO* 237–42, Sil. *Pun.* 12.458–62. The tigress’s rage is genuine, the wife’s simulated.

**271** should end with a full stop. 272–5 are epexegetic of it. **cum simulat gemitus:** cf. Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 22.7, a brave soldier worsted by a courtesan’s ‘artificial sighs’ (ἐπιπλάστων...στεναγμῶν). **occulti...facti:** cf. Tib. 1.9.28 *facta tegenda*, likewise of amatory betrayal. *occultus* is common of stolen love, e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 2.81, Apul. *Met.* 9.24.1 *uxor...occulta libidine prurumpit in adulterum quempiam*.

**272 aut odit pueros:** she accuses her husband of sexual involvement with his boy-slaves (foll. n.), a likely enough scenario (Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.116–18,

Petr. 75.11, Muson. 12 (86 Lutz), Clarke 2003: 78–87, Williams 2010: 31–6, 52–4) and eminently capable of provoking an outburst of wifely jealousy (Petron. 74.8–9, Mart. 11.43.1–2, 12.96). But the immediately following *ficta* suggests that this complaint too is factitious. For *odium* directed to supposed erotic rivals cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.296 *inuida formosas oderat illa* [sc. *Pasiphaë*] *boves*. **pueros**: used in the loaded sense of *esclaves de luxe*, whose primary rôle was to satisfy their master's erotic desires (Garrido-Hory 1997: 312). **aut ficta paelice plorat** either 'she weeps because of an imaginary girlfriend', a bold extension of the ablative of cause in amatory contexts with reference to a person (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.4.19–20 *Lycidan ... quo calet iuuentus* | *nunc omnis* with N–H; H–S 133), or ablative absolute, 'she weeps after inventing a girlfriend'. On both explanations, the wife puts into play the *erotodidaxis* of Ov. *Ars* 3.677 *accedant lacrimae, dolor et de paelice fictus*, with the difference that *paelex* is here used *stricto sensu* of a husband's mistress (Adams 1983a: 355), rather than the looser sense of a rival to the elegiac *puella*.

**273–5** '[with] tears always in abundance and always ready in their place and only waiting to see in what way she may bid them to flow' Duff. **uber**, unique in Latin, apart from *pubes*, in having the force of both adjective and noun, is often used of 'copious' tears (*OLD* s.v. *uber*<sup>2</sup> 2b). *in statione sua*, 'at their post' is a military metaphor. *illam* is proleptic accusative, that is, the object of a verb in the main clause when it should properly be the subject of a subordinate clause – often as here an indirect question: cf. Cic. *Tull.* 13 *nunc rem ipsam, ut gesta sit, dum breuiter uobis demonstro, attendite*, H–S 471–2.

**275 quo iubeat manare modo**: inspired by Ov. *Ars* 3.291–2 *quo non ars penetrat? discunt lacrimare decenter, | quoque uolunt plorare tempore, quoque modo*. For *iubere* cf. Ov. *Her.* 2.52 *hae quoque* [sc. *lacrimae*] *habent artes, quaque iubentur, eunt*; Mart. 1.33.2. **tu credis amorem**: the wife's apparent distress at her husband's alleged infidelities persuades him that she loves him (*amorem* sc. *esse*). For fake tears producing such a conviction cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.677–80, Plut. *Ant.* 53.7; for the credulousness of lovers faced with these, Posidipp. *Anth. Pal.* 5.186.1 (πιθανοῖς ... δάκρυσι), Tib. 1.9.37–8.

**276 tu tibi tunc ... places** 'you preen yourself' on your wife's 'proof' of her love. Cf. Ov. *Rem. am.* 685–6 *desinimus tarde, quia nos speramus amari; | dum sibi quisque placet, credula turba sumus*, Juv. 10.41–2, *CIL* VI 37965.16 *haec sibi non placuit*. **uruca** 'you worm', apparently a nonce usage characterising the worthlessness of the husband, no doubt inspired by the insulting metaphors *lumbricus* and σκώληξ (used, however, in a different context from here). Similar in spirit to the present instance is Plaut. *Cas.* 239 *cana culex*, also of a despised husband. It may additionally be relevant that

worms lack eyes (Plin. *HN* 11.140), suggesting the subject's blindness to his wife's infidelities (277–8). Grazzini 1993 argues for the poorly attested reading *curuca*, a bird which broods the eggs which the *cuculus*, 'cuckoo', deposits supposititiously in its nest, contending that the term would thus signify 'cuckold' (referring to the husband rearing his wife's bastards as his own), but that is not the issue here.

**276–7 fletumque labellis | exorbes:** lovers kiss away the beloved's tears (Ov. *Ars* 2.325–6 *et uideat [te] flentem... | et sicco lacrimas combibat ore tuas*, *Fast.* 3.509), and *labellis* has a pronounced amatory flavour. But *exorbes* ironises the whole. *ex(s)orbere*, 'suck up, suck in', here applied uniquely to tears, almost invariably has an unwholesome colour, used of substances such as blood, innards or wine sediment (*TLL* v 2.1880–1).

**277–8** Were the husband to open the writing-chest of his wife (*tibi* is dative of agent), he would find it full (*quot*) of letters from her paramours. *tabellae* are wax writing tablets, often used to convey clandestine messages between lovers: cf. Plut. *Ant.* 58.1, Ov. *Am.* 2.5.5 with Booth, Leary on Mart. 14.8. *scrinia* are small, square or round receptacles for storing book rolls or correspondence (*scriniis epistularum* Plin. *HN* 7.94): cf. Birt 1907: 248–55 and, for a good illustration, Bieber 1959: 396 fig. 36.

**277 lecture:** used in place of *lecturus* by attraction to vocative *tu* 276 and serving as the apodosis to the following *si*-clause.

**278 zelotypae... moechae:** a neat oxymoron of the type *meretrix Augusta* 118. For the female proclivity to sexual jealousy (the adjective transliterates Gk. ζήλοτυπος, 'jealous'), here cynically exploited by the *matrona*, see 268–85n. Given that the *zelotypus* was a character in the mime (8.197), *zelotypae* carries a clear implication that her tears are play-acting. For the adjective cf. Petron. 69.2, further Fantham 1986: 53–4.

**279 sed** 'suddenly alters the situation and introduces a new possibility' Weidner, the change being that her adultery is now out in the open. **iacet in serui complexibus aut equitis:** the lady, presumably of senatorial rank, engages in a liaison with someone of a lower class, in the case of the slave particularly shocking (cf. Edwards 1993: 52–3). Satirists never weary of picturing supposedly respectable women enjoying illicit relationships with males of servile status (cf. Petron. 126.5–7, Mart. 6.39 with Grewing), but these undoubtedly did occur (Tac. *Ann.* 12.53, Suet. *Vesp.* 11, Muson. 12 (86 Lutz), Richlin 1981: 385).

**279–80 'dic | ...colorem':** the wife is imagined as appealing to Quintilian, the master of rhetoric, to suggest arguments in her defence. The geminated imperatives, rare in poetry of the Empire and usually separated as here by an intervening line-boundary, add a note of intensity appropriate

to her situation (Wills 1996: 89–91). *color*, ‘line of defence’, is a technical term for the ‘varnish’ put by a speaker on the facts of a case in order to present these in the most favourable light, and is associated particularly with hard-to-defend cases (Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.100, 12.1.33 *cur tu de coloribus et difficilium causarum defensione... locutus es?*, Lausberg §329). Sen. *Controv.* 2.1.34–6 examines the various *colores* which might be used in one of the situations envisaged in 279, viz. when a wife was caught *in flagranti* with a slave.

**280 sodes:** a syncopated, colloquial form of *si audes*, ‘if you please’, with vulgar spelling of *au* as *o*. **hic** ‘in this situation’. **Quintiliane:** by the second century AD single-name addresses by cognomen had become the standard form (Dickey 2002: 63).

**281 ‘haeremus. dic ipsa’:** Quintilian’s answer: ‘I am at a loss. Suggest one (a *color*) yourself.’ That Quintilian, of all people, should be stumped highlights how indefensible her situation is.

**281–3 ‘olim conuenerat... | ... | indulgere mihi’:** the *matrona*’s defence, ‘we long ago agreed that each of us could indulge our desires as we liked’, extends to herself the traditional licence of the husband to stray (e.g. Men. *Epit.* 693–6, Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 140b, Treggiari, *RM* 299–309, 511–13). It also wickedly inverts the ideal of partnership (κοινωνία / *societas*) which was the cornerstone of a successful union (231n.), not least on the physical side: cf. Eusebius, fr. 57 Müller (Stob. 4.582) ‘the best kind of concord in a marriage is when both parties observe sexual continence’, Muson. 13A, 14, Antipater, *On marriage* 3.255 von Arnim. In this case, the partnership consists of both parties engaging in sexual indulgence.

**281 olim** implies that the ‘agreement’ has acquired binding force by reason of long standing. **conuenerat** ‘it was agreed’ (the pluperfect is used, as often, with the force of a perfect). The verb refers to an informal agreement, which the wife alleges to have been made. There may also be a humorous allusion to the formal *conuentum* (25–6n.), which might involve negotiations of some kind, though these would normally be about matters such as the dowry (Plaut. *Trin.* 569–70, 1157–60, *Aul.* 257–8).

**282–3 nec non ego possem | indulgere mihi:** a case of *minutio*, ameliorating the facts by deliberate understatement (Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.77, 5.13.26, 8.4.1, Lausberg §402). What the *matrona* actually means is that she should have the licence to sleep with anyone she likes. For ‘indulging oneself’ as code for sexual indulgence cf. Cic. *Leg.* 1.39, Quint. *Inst.* 8.5.17.

**283–4 clames licet et mare caelo | confundas:** i.e. ‘though you make a tremendous fuss’. *mare caelo confundere* is proverbial: here it characterises furious anger (Diogenian, ap. *Paroem.* 2.20, Otto s.v. *caelum* 1).

**284 homo sum:** the wife's second line of defence: 'to err is human', another proverbial expression (Otto s.v. *homo* 2–3); perhaps also an ironic echo of 222, where a wife uses similar language to *reject* an attempted defence (Uden). For the proverb used with reference to a sexual misdemeanour cf. Herod. *Mimiamb.* 5.26–7, Ter. *Ad.* 470–1, Petron. 130.1 *fateor me, domina, saepe peccasse: nam et homo sum et adhuc iuuenis.*

**284–5 nihil est audacius illis | deprensus** 'nothing has greater effrontery than them if caught'. The line is informed by the perception that women are naturally given to shamelessness and barefaced impudence: cf. Alexis, fr. 291 K–A 'there is no creature more devoid of shame than a woman' with Arnott, Plaut. *Mil.* 307 *quid peius muliere aut audacius?*, Watson 2008a: 275 n. 41.

**285 iram atque animos a crimine sumunt:** for the tactic, cf. Apul. *Met.* 2.29 *uxor... capit praesentem audaciam* (a murderess boldly faces down her accuser), Tac. *Ann.* 11.26 *flagitiis manifestis subsidium ab audacia petendum*. Also relevant: Diphil. fr. 110 K–A 'there is no creature braver (cf. *animos*) than a shameless one'.

**286–300** *Where did this corruption of women's morals come from? In the old days, a humble lifestyle, hard work and external threats kept them chaste. Now a long peace, wealth and imported luxuria have given every kind of female immorality free rein.*

In the middle of the Satire, J. pauses to consider the origins of the feminine misconduct against which he has been inveighing. He adopts for the most part a highly conventional stance, echoing the sentiments of the moralists who traced Rome's ethical decline back to her foreign expansion in the second century BC and the influx of Eastern wealth, a decline accelerated by the removal of the Carthaginian threat and a period of peace: e.g. Liv. 39.6.7 *luxuriae enim peregrinae origo ab exercitu Asiatico inuecta in urbem est*, Vell. Pat. 2.1.1 *potentiae Romanorum prior Scipio uiam aperuerat, luxuriae posterior aperuit: quippe remoto Carthaginis metu sublataque imperii aemula non gradu, sed praecipiti cursu a uirtute descitum, ad uitia transcursum; uetus disciplina deserta, noua inducta; in somnum a uigiliis, ab armis ad uoluptates, a negotiis in otium conuersa ciuitas*, Plin. *HN* 33.150, Earl 1967: 17–19, Lintott 1972, Edwards 1993: 176–8. In this tradition it was customary to contrast the humble, rustic lifestyle of the past, informed by the Roman virtues of hard work and military prowess, with the contemporary love of *luxuria* and immorality, especially in the sexual sphere: e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6 (see 286n., 290–1n.). To suit the context, however, J. presents this tradition exclusively from the viewpoint of the Roman *matrona*. Moreover, whereas moralists regarded the innocence of early Rome as intrinsic to Roman nature (e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 9.1 *igitur domi militiaeque boni mores colebantur... ius bonumque apud*

*cos non legibus magis quam natura ualebat*), J. cynically suggests (287–91) that early Roman women refrained from adultery not through any inherent moral superiority but through lack of opportunity. Finally, as with the Golden Age *matrona* of 5–10, J. describes a paradigm in such terms as to undermine its appeal: thus the *Latinae*, in performing their wool-working, have hands that are unattractively rough (*uexatae duraeque manus* 290), a detail recalling the unappealing appearance of the *immundae Sabinae* at whom Ovid liked to sneer (*Am.* 1.8.39, *Medic.* 13–14, quoted 289–90n.).

**286 unde haec monstra ... requiris:** cf. Cic. *Clu.* 188 on Sassia, *quod tantum monstrum in ullis locis ... aut unde natum esse dicamus?* **monstra** ‘prodigies’, apparently alluding to all the instances of errant females so far catalogued, including some (184–99, 242–5, 246–7) to whom the term hardly seems applicable. *monstrum* recurs at 645 with the meaning ‘monstrous behaviour’; cf. *prodigia* 84 of Eppia’s doings. J. is interested in *monstra* in both senses (Plaza 2006: 305–36). **quo de fonte:** cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.19–20 *hoc fonte deriuata clades | in patriam populumque fluxit*.

**287 castas:** sexually faithful to their husbands, a quality often associated with the simple rural life; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 2.39–40 with Watson, Virg. *G.* 2.524 *casta pudicitiam seruat domus*. The present assertion that Roman women were chaste until *luxuria* came on the scene is at odds with the earlier claim (24) that adultery began in the Silver Age. **humilis fortuna:** lack of wealth.

**288–9 nec uitiiis contingi parua sinebant | tecta:** *parua ... tecta* evokes the *parua casa*, the modest hut where rural dwellers once lived in exemplary marital chastity (see Watson 2004: 316–17), in contrast to contemporary metropolitan laxity.

**288 contingi** ‘to be infected’. See *incubuit* 293n.

**289 labor:** before the advent of *luxuria* and a household of slaves to do the hard work, the idealised women of the past engaged in a variety of tasks, such as tending the sheep and the hearth fire: cf. Hor. *Epod.* 2.39–48 with Watson, Ov. *Medic.* 15–16 *ipsaque claudebat, quos filia pauerat, agnos, | ipsa dabat uirgas caesaeque ligna foco*. **somnique breues:** hard labour left little time for prolonged sleep; cf. Ovid’s and Livy’s descriptions of Lucretia working late into the night at her wool (*Fast.* 2.741–3, Liv. 1.57.9; also Virg. *Aen.* 8.408 of a *lanifica* rising early to attend to her task). Conversely, the coming of *luxuria* was associated in the moralising tradition with sleeping to excess: e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 13.3 *dormire prius quam somni cupido esset*, Vell. Pat. cited 286–300n.

**289–90 uellere Tusco | uexatae duraeque manus:** in the early days, wool-working was the major occupation of women: cf. Ov. *Medic.* 13–14 [*Tatio*



*sub rege] matrona premens altum rubicunda sedile | assiduo durum pollice nebat opus*; it was also the symbol *par excellence* of matronly *castitas*: cf. Liv. 1.57.9 (Lucretia), Virg. *Aen.* 8.408–13 (a woman works at her wool) *castum ut seruare cubile | coniugis . . . possit*. Long after aristocratic women stopped spinning their own wool, *lanificium* remained a symbol of womanly virtue, particularly in epitaphs. See further Courtney, Larsson Lovén 1998.

**289 uellere Tusco**: local wool (Etruria lay immediately north of Rome), used in the days before foreign imports. *Tusco* also suggests the rustic innocence which the Etruscans often symbolised, e.g. Virg. *G.* 2.533 (of the idealised farmer's life) *sic fortis Etruria creuit*, Mart. 10.68.3 with W–W.

**290 uexatae duraeque manus**: their hands are 'chafed' and 'callused' from the constant work (cf. Ov. *Medic.* 14 quoted 289–90, *CLE* 1988.14 *lana cui e manibus nuncquam sine caussa recessit*, ibid. 24 for her *durae manus*). The harshness of the wool will also have played its part: Etruscan wool was inferior to that of Miletus and Tarentum (cf. 296–7) and other Italian varieties (Plin. *HN* 8.190, Columella, *Rust.* 7.2.3). In addition to the literal sense of *durus*, the context activates the resonances of rustic morality which the epithet shares with *Tuscos*: cf. Mart. 10.68.4 *durus Aricina de regione pater* with W–W.

**290–1** To illustrate the idea of an external military threat which left no scope for immoral behaviour (*longae pacis mala* 292n.), J. chooses Rome's most terrifying moment, in 211 BC, when Hannibal threatened the city itself. For an allusion to Hannibal in a similar context, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.33–8 *non his* [sc. corrupt, modern-day] *iuuentus orta parentibus | infecti aequor sanguine Punico, | Pyrrhumque et ingentem cecidit | Antiochum Hannibalemque dirum, | sed rusticorum mascula militum | proles*.

**291 stantes Collina turre mariti**: i.e. Rome's husbands were busy defending the city, thus depriving their wives of opportunities for misbehaviour (contrast Ar. *Thesm.* 493–6). *Collina turre* = a tower on the Colline gate. The Roman army was encamped between the Colline and Esquiline *portae*. J. singles out the former because it was there that Hannibal reached (Liv. 26.10.3).

**292 nunc patimur longae pacis mala**: the thought is explained by Sall. *Iug.* 41.2–4 *metus hostilis in bonis artibus ciuitatem retinebat. sed ubi illa formido mentibus decessit, scilicet ea, quae res secundae amant, lasciuiat atque superbia incessere. ita quod in aduersis rebus optauerant otium* ('peace') . . . *asperius acerbiusque fuit*. Cf. Luc. 1.160–7, Tac. *Agr.* 11.4, Lintott 1972: 627, Woodman on Vell. Pat. 2.110.2.

**292–3 saeuior armis | luxuria**: Roman moralising discourse loves to dilate on the destructive effects of *luxuria*, a luxurious and decadent lifestyle, e.g.

Sall. *Cat.* 11.5–7, Liv. 1. *praef.* 12 *nuper diuitiae auaritiam et abundantes uoluptates desiderium per luxum atque libidinem pereundi perdendique omnia inuexere.* It does not suit J.'s purpose to recognise the claim of Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.55) that during the period beginning with the reign of Vespasian Roman taste for *luxus* had significantly declined.

**293 incubuit:** 'like a hostile army' Courtney (cf. *OLD* *incumbo* 5a): but J. may mean us to think additionally of *incubare*, which also has a perfect *incubui*, in the sense of a moral pestilence which 'broods over' a land (*OLD* *incubo*<sup>1</sup> 1d). For the latter cf. *contingi* 288 and, in a similar context to the present, Sall. *Cat.* 10.6 *post ubi contagio quasi pestilentia inuasit. uictumque ulciscitur orbem:* the subjugated territories avenged themselves by exporting to Rome the *luxus* for which they were notorious, a moralising variation on the topos of the defeated defeating the conqueror (cf. Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.156). *luxuria*, it was agreed, was first introduced to Italy by Roman soldiers returning from campaigns in the East (cf. 295–7). Cf. Liv. 39.6.7 cited 286–300n., Plin. *HN* 33.148, Flor. 1.47.7 *Syria prima nos uicta corrumpit, mox Asiatica Pergameni hereditas*, Polyb. 31.25.4–6.

**294–5 nullum... | paupertas Romana perit:** in typically Roman fashion (Edwards 1993: 5, 176–7), *luxuria* is said to express itself in sexual immorality; cf. Sall. *Cat.* and Livy cited 292–3n.

**294 ex quo** 'from the time when'.

**295 paupertas:** not abject poverty but a modest sufficiency (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 87.40), idealised in the moralising tradition for the pristine virtues which it inculcated, as opposed to the corrupting effects of latter-day *diuitiae*: cf. Luc. 1.165–6 cited 299n. Val. Max. 4.4.11 neatly encapsulates such attitudes. **Romana:** the idealisation of *paupertas* was characteristically Roman, e.g. Liv. 1 *praef.* 11 *nec ubi [sc. Romae] tantus ac tam diu paupertati ac parsimoniae honos fuerit*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.2.1–3, Sen. *Ep.* 87.41. **perit:** perfect tense.

**295–6 hinc... ad istos | ...colles** 'from this loss of Roman *paupertas*'... 'to these hills', i.e. to this city of Rome. In Latin of the Empire *iste* may = *hic*: *OLD* *iste* 4. The radical emendation of these words by Hendry 1997, notably *Isthmos* for *istos*, does not convince.

**295 fluxit:** cf. Hor. *Carm.* cited 286n., Juv. 3.62 *iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes*, Tac. *Ann.* 15.44.

**296 Sybaris:** first of a series of Greek cities used to represent Eastern/Greek decadence. Sybaris was a colony in South Italy, founded by Achaeans and Troezenians in 720 BC and destroyed in 510 BC. The Sybarites'

addiction to luxury was notorious: see Ath. 518c–522d. Also relevant in the present context of loose living are the highly erotic ‘Sybaritic’ verses mentioned by Martial (12.95.2) and others. **Rhodos:** the Rhodians were admonished by Stratonikus for their lavish spending on feasts (Plut. *De cupid. divit.* 525b); Juv. 8.113 describes the young men of Rhodes as effeminate. **Miletos:** Miletus’ empire over the Scythians collapsed after the Milesians succumbed to pleasure and luxury: so Athenaeus reports (523e–f; cf. 524b), also ascribing decadent and licentious ways to their colony Abydus (524f–525b). One also thinks of the Milesian tales, notorious for bawdiness.

**297** the inhabitants of Tarentum, a Spartan colony in southern Italy, were famous for their love of luxury and pleasure; see Ath. 522d–f, Serv. Dan. on Virg. *Aen.* 3.551, Wuilleumier 1939: 229–35. In particular, they had a reputation for heavy drinking (cf. *madidum*: see Wuilleumier 1939: 232), but J. seems to have especially in mind an infamous incident in 282 BC when, at a celebration of the Dionysia in the theatre at Tarentum, a party of Roman ambassadors was verbally insulted (cf. *petulans*) and jeered at by the drunken mob, one of them, Postumius, having his garment soiled with excrement (Dio. Cass. fr. 39.7 Melber, Val. Max. 2.2.5, Wuilleumier 1939: 103–4). **coronatum:** wearing garlands, as was usual at festivals and drinking parties.

**298–300** *prima...|...|...molles* makes a conventional association between the coming of wealth to Rome from foreign parts and the introduction of Eastern luxury and immorality (see further 286–300n.). *prima* goes with *intulit*: it was money that first initiated the downward trend.

**298:** notable for the alliteration of *p* and *c*: the Speaker spits out his condemnation of money. **obscena** ‘disgusting’ i.e. leading to indecent, disgusting behaviour. Cf. *molles* 300 for a further active use of an adjective. Thierfelder 1956 surveys the various meanings of the strongly pejorative *obscaenus*. **mores** can = ‘customs’ or ‘morals’ (Edwards 1993: 3–4): here both senses are combined.

**299** *turpi* ‘debased’. *turpis* is often used of what is sexually degraded and so builds a bridge to the next scene of sensational *impudicitia*. **fregerunt** ‘enervated, made *mollis*’: *OLD frango* 8. In moralising discourse the idea is often expressed that the incursion of wealth and attendant *luxuria* emasculated the previously virile and ascetic spirit of the Romans, e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 11.3 *avaritia pecuniae studium habet... ea quasi uenenis malis imbuta corpus animumque uirilem effeminat*, Luc. 1.160–67 esp. 164–6 *cultus gestare decoros | uix nuribus rapuere mares: fecunda uirorum | paupertas fugitur*. **saecula** ‘the ages, the generations’, plural: the process of degeneration was agreed

to have begun in the second century BC. As often in moralising contexts, *saeculum* has a pejorative flavour: cf. Hor. *Epod.* 16.64–5 *ut inquinavit aere tempus aureum, | aerea dehinc ferro duravit saecula*, Löfstedt 1933: 470–3. *luxu*: derogatory, = *luxuria*; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 53.5 *luxu atque desidia ciuitas corrupta*; OLD *luxus*<sup>3</sup> 1.

**300** *diuitiae molles*: riches are called *molles* because they lead to *mollitia* (for which see Edwards 1993: ch. 2). For the thought see Sall. *Cat.* 11.5 *loca amoena, uoluptaria facile in otio feroces animos molliuerant*; Edwards 1993: 92–7.

**300–13** *Women have no sense of sexual propriety when they get drunk at late-night carousals. Just consider the behaviour of Maura and Tullia who, returning from nocturnal revelry, relieve themselves on Pudicitia's altar, then ride one another, leaving a puddle through which you splash on your way to the morning salutatio.*

**300–5** The attack on *luxuria* proceeds from the general to the particular, using as exemplification the common Satiric theme of the banquet, as often in discussions of *luxuria* (see Dubois-Pelerin 2008: 61, Edwards 1993: 186–8). To suit the context, J. focuses on an anonymous, but supposedly typical woman, portraying her as over-eating and drinking; she is also depicted as sexually promiscuous, in keeping with the link commonly made by moralists between *luxus* and *libido* (e.g. Liv. 1 *praef.* 12, Tac. *Hist.* 1.10.4, Edwards 1993: 5) and, in the case of women, between drunkenness and adultery (*uenus ebria* 300n.). Such behaviour was scandalous in a *matrona* for two reasons: (1) it was unfeminine, the sort of behaviour characteristic rather of males: cf. Sen. *Ep.* 95.21 *non minus peruigilant, non minus potant, et oleo et mero uiros prouocant... libidine uero ne maribus quidem cedunt... quia feminam exuerant, damnatae sunt morbis uirilibus*; (2) it was associated with common prostitutes and women of low status (Petron. 70.10, Alciph. *Letters of courtesans* 13–14); cf. Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.761–8.

**300** *uenus ebria* ‘drunken lust’, standing metonymically for a woman who is drunken and lustful. The striking phrase neatly captures the nexus between excessive drinking and sexual immorality, for which cf. Tib. 1.9.59–60 *nec lasciua soror dicatur plura bibisse | pocula uel plures emeruisse uiros*, intro. 25–6. It was the reason why female drinking was prohibited in the past, Val. Max. 2.1.5b *uini usus olim Romanis feminis ignotus fuit, ne scilicet in aliquod dedecus prolaberentur, quia proximus a Libero patre intemperantiae gradus ad inconcessam uenerem esse consuevit*, Minieri 1982. As usual, J. presents an exaggerated view of contemporary reality: he represents his unnamed female as imbibing so copiously as to realise precisely the fears expressed by Valerius, ignoring the fact that by J.’s time it was quite acceptable for respectable women to drink, provided that consumption was not

excessive. See Dunbabin 2003: 23, 67–8, Schultz 2006: 131–4. **ebria:** explains why *non curat*.

**301** In her drunken state she does not distinguish between her *cunnus* and her mouth, i.e. engages indiscriminately in both vaginal sex and *fellatio*. Since oral sex was associated particularly with low prostitutes (O14–16n., Krenkel 2006: 210–12, 215), it suggests the depths of depravity to which the woman has sunk. **inguinis:** = *cunni*: cf. Mart. 3.88.1, Auson. *Ep.* 86.1. Except for Horace in his first book, the Satirists generally avoid basic obscenities (Adams, *LSV* 221–2). **capitis:** i.e. *oris*, a common euphemism in the context of *fellatio*: cf. Mart. 2.44.2, above 49n.

**302 grandia...ostrea:** oysters were a delicacy (cf. Mart. 3.60.3, Andrews 1948: 300–1) and large ones especially luxurious (Varro, *Sat. Men.* 549 Astbury). They were often associated with gourmets and over-indulgence, e.g. Varro, *ibid.*, Juv. 4.139–42 with Courtney (but were not as now ascribed aphrodisiac qualities, though this might seem to fit the context). The present passage is in the tradition of satiric attacks on female gluttony: cf. Semon. fr. 7.24, 46–7 W, Ar. *Thesm.* 418–25, [Lucian,] *Am.* 42, Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.759–60. **mediis iam noctibus:** given that the normal dinner time was after the ninth hour, i.e. in mid-afternoon, banqueting late into the night was seen as a sign of depravity; cf. Tib. 1.9.59–64, Sen. *Ben.* 6.32.1, *Ep.* 95.21 quoted 300–5n., Alciphr. *Letters of courtesans* 13–14. For the particular expression cf. Juv. 4.136–9 *nouerat ille | luxuriam imperii ueterem noctesque Neronis | iam medias aliamque famem, cum pulmo Falerno | arderet*; similarly, the drunken woman here satisfies her ‘second hunger’ with a midnight snack of oysters – normally consumed much earlier, as the first course of the meal. **mordet** ‘she chomps’ (Braund). A large oyster might need more than one bite: cf. the so-called *tridacna*, oysters *taetae amplitudinis...ut ter mordenda essent* Plin. *HN* 32.63.

**303–4 cum perfusa...|...concha:** at a Roman *cena*, wine was normally drunk with water added to each individual’s cup according to their taste. Here, undiluted wine is mixed with perfume, as at Petron. 70.9. This combination was not so unusual (cf. Plin. *HN* 13.25, 14.107–8). What is unusual is that, instead of adding perfume to the wine, as in the above instances, the wine is poured into the perfume jar, from which the banqueters drink (*bibitur concha* – such jars might be large: cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.7.22–3). Drinking from a common vessel suggests Greek practice (see Pl. *Symp.* 214a, Dunbabin 1995). The allusion to the Greek symposium follows on neatly from the attack in 295–7 on their cities as the source of *luxuria* (cf. especially *madidum...Tarentum*). Other elements reinforce the idea of a debauch: perfume is frequently associated with drunken revels,

as is undiluted wine (*merum*); Falernian wine is expensive; drinking from a *concha* rather than a wine jar is exotic. A further contribution is J.'s choice of language: *perfusa* and *spumant* both suggest lavish excess.

**304–5 cum iam uertigine tectum | ambulat:** for drunkenness so characterised cf. Sen. *Ep.* 83.21 *uertiginem capitis, tecta ipsa mobilia uelut aliquo turbine circumagente totam domum*, Lucian, *Dial. marin.* 2.2 'everything seemed to whirl round and round and the [Cyclops'] cave itself started to turn upside down'.

**305 geminis exsurgit mensa lucernis:** the table appears to rise up and the lamp upon it appears double. For the multiplication of lamps when drunk, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.24–5 *ut semel icto | accessit feruor capiti numerusque lucernis*, Petron. 64.2, Ov. *Ars* 3.764 with Gibson.

**306–13** In a graphic illustration of the association, common in Roman moralists (Edwards 1993: 44–6), between religious decline and female sexual misbehaviour, J. passes to an outdoor scene, in which two aristocratic *matronae* insult the altar of Pudicitia, then urinate on it and engage in lesbian sex (activities broadly indebted to Seneca's account of Julia's doings *Ben.* 6.32). 306–13 are closely integrated with the preceding section. The amount of urine (310) suggests that the women have been drinking hard (cf. 300, 304–5), as does the lesbianism – often seen as the result of drunkenness: cf. Cael. Aurel. *Chron.* 4.9 (on tribades) *frequenter ebrietate corruptae in nouas libidinis formas erumpentes... sui sexus iniuriis gaudent*, Lucian, *Dial. meret.* 5, Schrijvers 1985: 34. The clearest indication that 306–13 are directly linked with 300–5 is the ironic introductory formula *i nunc et dubita*, i.e. 'after the events just described, can you doubt the veracity of the tale which I am going to impart?': note also the repetition of *noctibus* 309 (cf. 302). In insulting the altar of Pudicitia, the goddess who embodies the cardinal virtue of respectable wives, the women graphically demonstrate their rejection of matronal values: cf. 300–1. Further, just as excessive eating and drinking was regarded as both unwomanly and debased (300–5n.), so here the women are depicted as behaving like men, and, in addition, like low prostitutes. They desecrate a monument by relieving themselves on it (309–10n.); they urinate in the manner of men (310n.); they are out on the streets at night after a drunken revel, normally a male practice; they engage in lesbianism, often depicted as quasi-masculine (W–W 251); they adopt a horse-riding position, usually associated with heterosexual coitus (cf. Krenkel 1987: 55–6, *inque uices equitant* 311n.). As for the assimilation to prostitutes, they resemble these in using the equine position (311n.), perhaps too in engaging in *al fresco* sex, like *bustuariae moechae* (cf. O16n.).

**306–8 qua sorbeat aera sanna | Tullia, quid dicat notae collactea Maurae | Maura, Pudicitiae ueterem cum praeterit aram** ‘with what derisive gesture Tullia sniffs the air, what Maura, fellow-nursling of the notorious Maura, says when she passes the ancient altar of Pudicitia’. The lines are extremely difficult: for other readings and detailed discussion, see Appendix.

**306 i nunc et dubita:** *i nunc*, a largely poetic usage, is commonly used with sarcastic force, as here (Lease 1898, *OLD* *eo*<sup>1</sup> 10b). **sanna:** a gesture of derision and rejection made by wrinkling the nose (cf. Pers. 1.62 with Jahn, 5.91 *ira cadat naso rugosaeque sanna*; Sittl 1890: 86–7). Here it is accompanied by a contemptuous sniff (*sorbeat aera*).

**307 Tullia:** ‘the gens Tullia was an ancient patrician house which became extinct’ (Ferguson). **dicat:** presumably she makes some scornful and/or obscene remark which would be ill-omened in the presence of the deity.

**307–8 notae collactea Maurae | Maura** lit. ‘Maura, fellow-nursling of the notorious Maura’. *collactanei* (-ae) were babies who shared a wet-nurse, but the phrase is best taken in a metaphorical sense. Given that *fellare* means to suck a teat and semen can be referred to as ‘milk’ (see Appendix), the implication is that Maura, who sucks the same ‘milk’ as the notorious Maura, is a *fellatrix*, like her namesake.

**307 notae...Maurae:** presumably refers to the woman mentioned at 10.223–4 *quot longa uiros exorbeat uno | Maura die*. The status of this Maura – apparently a well-known *fellatrix* – is unclear, but *nota* might suggest that she was upper-class: in the sense ‘notorious’, the term is often applied to men or women of high social status known for inappropriate morals; cf. esp. Cic. *Cael.* 31 *cum Clodia, muliere non solum nobili uerum etiam nota*.

**308 Maura:** given that J.’s primary targets in *Sat.* 6 are aristocratic *matronae*, Maura is best thought of, like Tullia, as belonging to this group. Cf. also *lecticas* 309n. **Pudicitiae ueterem...aram:** it is debated whether J. is alluding to the shrine of Pudicitia Patricia in the Forum Boarium (Liv. 10.23.3; Fest. 282 L) or that of Pudicitia Plebeia in the Vicus Longus (Liv. 10.23.6–7, Fest. 270 L), which had fallen into neglect but may have been restored by Livia: see Palmer 1974: 143–4. In either event, since the rite at both shrines was open only to *uniuiuae* and *matronae* of proven chastity (Liv. 10.23.9), the women’s behaviour at the altar ironically underscores their rejection of matronal values. Coins of Plotina from AD 112 also attest an altar of Pudicitia, either erected in honour of/by Trajan’s wife Plotina as embodiment of that virtue (Hill 1989: 64, Richardson 322), or else issued on the occasion of Plotina’s restoration of the shrine of Pudicitia Patricia (Palmer 1974: 142), but an allusion to this would fit less well with the description *ueterem*. **cum praeterit:** the women express their derision

(*sanna, dicat*) as they pass the altar, in contrast to normal practice, which was to raise a hand to the lips and kiss it in a sign of respect (Plin. *HN* 28.25, Sittl 1890: 182, Turcan 2000: 59). Roman veneration of divinities was highly gestural (Corbeill 2004: 26–33).

**309–10 micturiunt... | ...implent:** urinating on an image of a god or an altar was a gesture of contempt and caused serious offence to the deity: cf. Suet. *Ner.* 56 *religionum usque quaque contemptor, praeter unius Deae Syriae, hanc mox ita spreuit ut urina contaminaret*, Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.38, Pers. 1.112–14 with Kissel, Lentano 1995: 79–81. In every case except here, it is males who commit the offence.

**309 lecticas:** their possession of litters suggests wealth and status: cf. Sen. *Constant.* 14.1, Brown 1983, McGinn 1998b: 245–7. **micturiunt:** only here and 16.46: a genuine desiderative rather than = *meiunt*, the termination reflecting either the women's need to relieve themselves after consuming a large volume of wine (306–13n.) or their contemptuous desire to desecrate the altar (Bellandi). For a desiderative used of bodily functions cf. Mart. 11.77.3 *cenaturit Vacerra, non cacaturit*, χεζητιάω.

**310 effigiemque deae:** J. probably has in mind an altar with a depiction of the goddess in relief on its front, as the coins of Plotina (308n.) seem to show (for the practice see Bowerman 1913). The women urinate on the altar, their urine running down the front and drenching the image of the goddess. **longis siphonibus** 'in long jets'. A *sipho* is a 'jet' of liquid forced upwards out of a tube (Lentano 1995: 85, *OLD* s.v. b). The description is suggestive of male urination, which accords with the idea that these women are behaving more like men than women (306–13n.). **implent** suggests, like *longis*, the great quantity of wine which they have imbibed: in Mart. 6.89.6 a receptacle is similarly 'filled' (*plena*) with urine by one who has drunk to excess.

**311** Compounding the offence of 310, the women engage in sex (homosexual sex at that, and before Pudicitia!). The seriousness of their actions is illustrated by Ov. *Met.* 10.681–707, where Hippomenes, disastrously, has intercourse with Atalanta before the statues of the *ueteres dei* (cf. *ueterem... aram* 308). **inque uices equitant:** they take it in turns to ride each other (Adams, *LSV* 166 and n. 2). In this schema (κελητιζειν), the woman sits astride a male 'horse', but here the mount is female. The detail gains additional force from the great disapprobation to which lesbian activities were subject in Antiquity (Watson 2003: 217–18), as also from the association of the *schema* with prostitutes and libertine females (*LSV* 165–6, van Mal-Maeder 2001: 413–15). **Luna teste** underscores the idea of sacrilege. As goddess of the sky, the Moon is all-seeing (8.149–50 *nocte quidem, sed Luna uidet, sed sidera testes | intendunt oculos*) and, like the



Sun, is affronted by witnessing the impious deeds of humans: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.34–6 *uideres... Lunam... rubentem | ne foret his testis, post magna latere sepulcra*, Lucian, *Icaromenipp.* 21. **mouentur**: passive with middle sense, referring to sexual motions: cf. Mart. 7.18.5–6 *mixtisq[ue] mouemur | inguinibus*, Adams, *LSV* 195; κινεῖν is similarly used.

**312–13** In a graphic climax, J. imagines a husband stepping in his wife's urine on his early morning round to attend the *salutatio* of his patrons (*amicos*). The scenario has some basis in fact (see Scobie 1986: 416–21 on the unsanitary condition of Roman streets), but consistency is here sacrificed for comic effect. It is poor clients who tramp the pavements *en route* to the *salutatio*. An upper-class male – such a person is most likely to have *magnos amicos* – would avail himself of a litter, like his wife, as does the *diues* of *Sat.* 3.239–42 attending the morning *levée*.

**312 tu**: generalising, i.e. the husband of an aristocratic woman like Maura or Tullia. **luce reuersa**: the *salutatio* was held at daybreak (W–W 321).

**313 magnos... amicos**: for the expression cf. Juv. 1.33 *magni delator amici*. *amicus* was used of either party in a patron–client relationship (Saller 1982: 11–15).

**314–45** *Everyone knows what the matronae get up to at the ceremony of Bona Dea, when wine and music arouse them to a fever of sexual excitement. They engage in contests of erotic dancing. Then as one they call for their lovers but, failing that, have sex with the lowest of males, or, as a last resort, an ass. If only such rites were free from corruption! But Clodius' penetration of the sacra of Bona Dea is all too notorious. Nowadays, however, this behaviour has become the norm.*

The themes of drunkenness, sexual abandon and scorn for religion are continued, as J. passes from the debauched behaviour of two noble women to a more widespread instance of depravity: the outrageous conduct of upper-class females at the Bona Dea ceremony. The sensational desecration of these rites by Clodius in 62 BC, with which the passage ends, is presented in such a way as to direct the blame away from Clodius and onto the women. First, the ritual is described, in terms that equate it with ecstatic Eastern cults such as the rites of Dionysus, which were popularly believed to involve drunken sexual orgies (e.g. Liv. 39.8.5–6 *additae uoluptates religioni uini et epularum, quo plurimum animi illicerentur. cum uinum animos incendisset, et nox et mixti feminis mares, aetatis tenerae maioribus, discrimen omne pudoris exstinxissent, corruptelae primum omnis generis fieri coeptae*, cf. Jameson 1993: 60–1, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 17.57, *uino* 315n., *antro* 328n.). Moreover, continuing the theme of 300–13, the whole focus is on sex: the ritual is merely a means of arousing the women's erotic appetites until, unable to contain themselves any longer, they demand the admission of males. Foremost amid potential lovers is the adulterer (329), so that when J. eventually

reaches the most notorious celebration of the Bona Dea rites, the Clodius scandal, a frustrated attempt at adultery (336–41n.), this can be seen as a forerunner of a practice – allowing men into rites for purposes of sex – which J. alleges to have become commonplace (345).

**314 nota...secreta:** a counterfactual oxymoron. Not a lot is known about the details of the ritual, a major source being J.'s fanciful and unreliable accounts here and at 2.82–116. For the evidence see Brouwer 1989. **Bonae...Deae:** a Roman fertility goddess who had a temple at the base of the Aventine, where she was worshipped by women on 1 May. J. is referring here to a second, nocturnal (cf. *dormitat* 329) rite, celebrated on 3 December, in the house of the consul or urban praetor, by upper-class *matronae* and the Vestals, from which all men, the master of the house included, were banned. The ritual featured a jar of wine and the offering of a sow (Juv. 2.86–7, Macrobian *Sat.* 1.12.23). It is unclear to what extent, if any, the Bona Dea rites resembled Eastern mystery religions: Plutarch (*Caes.* 9) likens them to Orphic rituals, since they included revelry and a great deal of music, while J. assimilates them to ecstatic Thracian rites (2.92), the worship of Cybele (2.111–16), and, here, to the mysteries of Priapus and Bacchus (316–17). Probably the Bona Dea rites were able to be confused with these mystery cults, taking on the same reputation for licentiousness, because they took place at night and in secret (cf. Brouwer 1989: 359, 369–70, Staples 1998: 43–4). **tibia:** an instrument from Phrygia with two pipes, one straight and the other curved, whence its alternative name *cornu* (315n.): cf. Mathiesen 1999: 196–7. It was used as an accompaniment to dancing in the rites of Cybele and the Dea Syria (Sen. *Ag.* 688–9 with Tarrant; Apul. *Met.* 8.26–7) and was likewise important in the rituals of Bacchus (e.g. Aesch. fr. 57.2–6 Radt, Ov. *Met.* 3.533). The only other evidence for the use of the *tibia* in the Bona Dea rites is the equally unreliable Juv. 2.90: it is likely that J. mentions it to exploit its associations of Eastern decadence.

**314–15 lumbos | incitat:** i.e. to dance (cf. Apul. *Met.* 8.27 *incitante tibia cantu lymphaticum tripudium*). Bona Dea was a fertility goddess and ritual dancing an integral part of Eastern fertility rites (Nilsson 1957: 59–61, Lawler 1964: 92–7) – often seen as a manifestation of oriental degeneracy (Lawler 135, Naerebout 2009: 156–7), an implication underscored by J.'s choice of language. *lumbos excitat* could also mean 'arouses sexually', *lumbi* being the site of erotic desire (Adams, *LSV* 48) and often highlighted in the context of extremely titillating dances, e.g. Mart. 5.78.26–8 *nec de Gadibus improbis puellae | uibrabunt sine fine prurientes | lasciuos docili tremore lumbos*.

**315 cornu...feruntur:** the *tibia* is often referred to thus because the longer of the pipes was curved at its end in the shape of a horn (Ath. 185a, Poll. *Onom.* 4.74, Becker 1966: Abb. 52 (136), 54 (139)). *feruntur* characterises the maddening effect of the pipes: cf. *Anth. Pal.* 7.223.3 'she who was carried away [φορουμένη] by the horned pipe', Eur. *Bacch.* 160-4, Ov. *Fast.* 4.341. **uinoque:** the Bona Dea ritual was rumoured to involve intoxication because wine played a part in the ceremony (Brouwer 1989: 331-6), also because it was assimilated to Bacchic and Orphic cults, which had a reputation for drunkenness (Livy quoted 314-45n.; Pl. *Resp.* 363c-d, Schol. Theoc. *Id.* 1.21). But J. is also playing more generally on the idea that, when women get together for female-only ceremonies, drink is a major preoccupation (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 392-4, Venit 1998), as well as the caution of 'Phintys the Pythagorean' that women should 'abstain from orgies and rites to Cybele which take place in house...for these bring about drunkenness and ecstasies of soul' (Stob. 4.593: cf. 590). Cf. also *Saufeia* 320n.

**316 attonitae:** 'frenzied' by the wine and the arousing music. Cf. Liv. 39.15.9 *uino, strepitibus clamoribusque nocturnis attoniti*. **crinemque rotant:** the hair, which was unbound in a number of orgiastic rites, including those of Bacchus (Liv. 39.13.12, Tac. *Ann.* 11.31), was 'whirled' when the head was tossed: cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 150, *Anth. Pal.* 6.219.2, Luc. 1.566-7, Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.71 *iactare* [sc. *caput*] *et comas excutientem rotare fanaticum est*. **ululantque:** of the ritual cries in ecstatic rites: cf. Liv. 39.8.8, 10.7, 15.6 *crepitibus etiam ululatibusque nocturnis*, Luc. 1.567. **Priapi:** an ithyphallic, sex-obsessed deity, whose cult originated at Lampsacus in Asia Minor, Priapus was the protector of Roman gardens. He played a part in most mystery rites, though in a playful mood (Diod. Sic. 4.6.4: cf. Burkert 1987: 104-5). See also next n.

**316-17 Priapi | maenades:** while there were in fact links between the cults of Priapus and Bacchus (Herter 1932: 303-6), and maenads sometimes bore names suggestive of sex (Henrichs 1978: 131-2), J.'s phrase nonetheless represents a deliberate conflation of rituals: the women in their revels behave like maenads, except that, being focused solely on sex (317-19), they worship Priapus rather than Bacchus. For similar slurs cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 222-3, Liv. 39.8-18.

**318-9 quantus | ...torrens!** 'flood' hyperbolically suggests the extent of the women's arousal.

**319 meri ueteris:** *merum*, lit. 'undiluted wine', is probably a euphemistic reference to the genital secretions of the sexually aroused women (Gold 1998: 374 n. 19). A passage of Eustathius (827.31) supports this interpretation: 'and in the same way they say Aeschylus spoke of the vine as μάχλος,

“lustful”, meaning “flowing with liquid”. Comedy spoke of the person who was moist with lust as *μάχλος*.<sup>7</sup> The epithet *ueteris*, routinely conjoined with *merum* in its literal sense, is, however, awkward on the above explanation: it will have to mean something like ‘age-old’. Braund suggested *Veneris*, but the double genitive ‘[a torrent] of the wine of Venus’ is clumsy. If emendation is resorted to, better would be *merae Veneris* ‘[a torrent] of undiluted Venus [sc. vaginal exudations]’ – a striking, but hardly exceptionable, expression: *Venus* is used of semen (e.g. Virg. *G.* 3.137), of which female secretions were thought by the ancients to be a form (Dean-Jones 1994: index s.v. ‘seed, female’).

**320–6** A contest in erotic dancing involving highly salacious movements of the buttocks, shockingly won by Saufeia despite the professional expertise of the *lenonum ancillae* in such matters, as exemplified by the titillating gyrations of the *Gaditanae* (Fear 1991), *Priapea* 19 and Alciphron, *Letters of courtesans* 14.4–6 (321 n.). According to Pliny (*HN* 10.172), Messalina successfully challenged a notorious prostitute (*nobilissimam e prostitutis ancillam*) to a contest of love-making, *regalem hanc existimans palmam*.

**320–1 lenonum ancillas posita Saufeia corona | prouocat:** Saufeia challenges (*prouocat*) the *ancillae* to a competition, putting down her garland (*posita corona*) as a wager: cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 355–6 *prouocat me in aleam, ut ego ludam: pono pallium; | ille suom anulum opposiuit*, Virg. *Ecl.* 3.36 *pocula ponam*, Griffith 1971: 136–7. The verb *ponere* can, however, also refer to the ‘putting up’ of prizes (*OLD* s.v. 13b) in athletic contests (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 5.292 *praemia ponit*, Mart. *Spect.* 31.5 *posita...palma*) and, given that such prizes are sometimes *coronae* (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 5.110), *corona* has been taken by some as equivalent to the *praemia* of 321. But this fails to take account of *prouocat*, and since the person who ‘puts up’ a prize is not usually a competitor, the explanation also involves taking *posita...corona* in the (less natural) sense ‘after a prize has been offered’ (by some unspecified party who is establishing the contest). This said, the idea that J. may be spoofing an epic athletic contest – amusingly ironic in this sordid context – is attractive for several reasons: (1) *corona* (320) and *palma* (323) appear among the *praemia* (110–11) in Virgil’s reworking (*Aen.* 5) of the funeral games in *Iliad* 23 for Patroclus; (2) *uirtus natalibus aequa* sarcastically suggests the Greek aristocratic ethos (323n.); (3) there is parody of epic language at 326 (n. ad loc.) and *aeuum* (325) in the sense ‘old age’ is poetic; (4) Nestor (326) plays a prominent rôle in *Iliad* 23, his physically weakened old age being emphasised, as here (but in a very different context).

**320 lenonum ancillas:** dancing girls engaged for the ceremony. They are referred to as ‘slaves of the pimps’, i.e. prostitutes (cf. Juv. 14.45–6),

because the professions of *saltatrix* and *meretrix* were virtually synonymous (cf. 320–6n.). **Saufeia:** used primarily to denote an aristocrat (see *RE* II 1.256–7 s.v. Saufeijs); participants in the ceremony were of the highest class (Schultz 2006: 21 n. 7). There might, however, have been a real dipsomaniac of that name: cf. Juv. 9.117, where a Saufeia is mentioned as engaging in excessive drinking *pro populo faciens*, presumably at the Bona Dea ceremony. **corona:** the garland combines the functions of a wager (320–1n.) and the *corona* worn at revels (*coronatum* 297n.).

**321 tollit...praemia coxae:** cf. Alciphron, *Letters of courtesans* 14.4–6, where two courtesans compete in a beauty competition by shaking their loins and buttocks, perhaps performing the *igdis*, a lascivious form of dance involving rotation of the hips (cf. Poll. *Onom.* 4.101, Lawler 1947). **tollit** ‘carries off’. **pendentis praemia coxae** ‘the prize for dangling her haunch’: for *praemium* + genitive, cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.26. At Apul. *Met.* 2.17 *super me sensim residens ac crebra subsiliens lubricisque gestibus mobilem spinam quatiens pendulae Veneris fructu me satiauit* (cf. Anth. Lat. 429.8–10 Riese), *pendula Venus* alludes to the *mulier equitans* position (cf. 311n.). In both this *schema* and the dance here described the woman’s bottom appears ‘suspended’ in the air.

**322 Medullinae:** another upper-class woman, Medullinus being a cognomen of the Furii. A Livia Medullina was at one time engaged to Claudius (see Raepsaet-Charlier 1987: 427). In view of a widespread perception that the *medullae* were the seat of erotic desire, Medullina is a peculiarly apt name for woman with a powerful sexual appetite (Rosenmeyer 1999: 45). **fluctum:** the wave-like movements made by a woman *quae crisat* (next n.): cf. Lucr. 4.1271, *Priap.* 19.4 *crisabit tibi fluctuante lumbo*, Rufin. Anth. Pal. 5.60.3–4 ‘her rounded buttocks vied with each other as they tossed, vibrating with flesh more liquid than water’, Butrica 2006: 27–8. **crisantis:** *crisare* refers to a woman moving her buttocks in a sexually arousing manner, either as part of an erotic dance (cf. Mart. 14.203.1, Butrica 2006), or else during, or as here a prelude to, sex: cf. the description of the seductive gyrations of Photis at Apul. *Met.* 2.7, *lumbis sensim uibrantibus spinam mobilem quatiens placide decenter undabat*, a passage linked by verbal parallels to her sexual motions as recounted in 2.17. **adorat** ‘admires, pays homage to’: Saufeia, after her win over the *ancillae*, is forced to admire the skill of her new opponent, further emphasising the superior prowess of the two upper-class women. Her admiration also stems from the great appreciation of female pygal beauty in Antiquity, which may even have a slight homoerotic tinge (Alciphron cited on *tollit...coxae*, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 8.5), thus connecting thematically with 311.

**323 palma inter dominas, uirtus natalibus aequa** ‘the prize is shared between the ladies, their excellence matching their pedigree’. As possessors of *uirtus*, traditionally an aristocratic quality, technically not available to slaves (McDonnell 2006: 159–60), they naturally defeat the *ancillae*. But their *uirtus* is expertise in erotic dancing, hardly a fitting accomplishment for upper-class *matronae*. For *uirtus* = ‘excellence, expertise’ cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 185.1 *Atalantam . . . quae uirtute sua cursu uiros superabat*. **uirtus natalibus aequa**: for the expression cf. *Laus Pisonis* 12 *tu, qui tantis animum natalibus aequas*. If, as suggested above, J. is spoofing a Greek athletic contest, the phrase suggests the aristocratic ethos of *arete* as inherited excellence, on which see Jaeger 1946: 3–14, Kurke 1991: 3–5.

**324–5 nil ibi . . . | ad uerum**: their dancing is not mere play but genuinely arousing foreplay prefacing the actual sex of 329–34.

**324 per ludum**: it was popularly believed that the votaries of Bona Dea engaged in some sort of play among themselves: cf. Prop. 4.9.33 *uos precor, o luci sacro quae luditis antro*; Plut. *Caes.* 10 (Aurelia’s maid, on meeting the disguised Clodius, invited him to ‘play’). A sexual element might have been thought to have been involved: cf. Brouwer 1989: 369, above 314–45<sup>n</sup>.

**325–6 quibus incendi . . . | . . . possit**: cf. *Anth. Pal.* 5.129, Mart. 6.71.3–4 *tendere quae tremulum Pelian Hecubaeque maritum | posset ad Hectoreos sollicitare rogos*, referring as here to a dance so provocative as to overcome the loss of virility associated in the satiric tradition with old age (cf. Cokayne 2003: 115–33).

**325 incendi iam frigidus aeuo**: the heat of arousal stands in pointed opposition to the ‘cold’ of impotent old age, sexual dysfunction in elderly males supposedly resulting from loss of the body heat necessary for concocting the blood to produce semen; cf. Arist. *Gen. an.* 725b.19–22, Eyben 1972: 684, and for *frigidus* in such a context, Virg. *G.* 3.97, Calp. *Decl.* 37 *amor . . . in senectute frigidior est*.

**326 Laomedontiades et Nestoris hirnea**: mock-epic: cf. *Laomedontiaden Priamum* (Virg. *Aen.* 8.158); *Nestoris hirnea* (‘herniated Nestor’) spoofs Homeric periphrases such as βίη Νέστορος ‘the mighty Nestor’ (for such locutions cf. Juv. 4.107 with Courtney). The parody is particularly outrageous, hernias having markedly sexual associations (next n.). Priam and Nestor are often coupled as *exempla* of extreme old age: cf. Mart. 2.64.3 with Williams. **hirnea**: the word properly refers to an inguinal hernia, i.e. an abnormal scrotal obtrusion (Celsus, *Med.* 7.18), but seems to be used loosely here to = *ramex*, ‘varicocele’, a varicose vein which also produced unsightly swelling in the scrotum (Celsus, *Med.* 7.22) and was

popularly associated with old age and impotence: cf. Lucil. 331–2 *Marx senex...ramice magno*, Juv. 10.205–6 [in old age] *iacet exiguus cum ramice neruus*, | *et quamuis tota palpetur nocte, iacebit*, Lucill. *Anth. Pal.* 11.132.6. On hernias/*ramices* as a vehicle for sexual humour see Watson 2008b.

**327 prurigo**: refers to urgent sexual arousal; cf. Mart. 11.73.3, *Priap.* 27.3, Krenkel 2006: 313. **morae impatiens**: cf. 238. **tum femina simplex** ‘then it’s woman pure and simple’. Females were supposedly prone to excessive lust (Just 1989: 159–62, Edwards 1993: 42–7, 78–84); J. goes further, making sexual desire the very essence of feminine nature.

**328 pariter...repetitus clamor**: the cry is uttered repeatedly in unison; cf. Liv. 10.5.7 *pariter sustulit clamorem acies*. Possibly a parody of a ritual chant (cf. phrases repeated three times in the hymn of the Arval Brethren, *CIL* I 28). **antro** ‘grotto’. For the ceremony, the hall ceiling of the host-magistrate’s house was decorated with vine twigs to create a sacred enclosure (σηκός Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 268d, Sen. *Ep.* 97.2); see Brouwer 1989: 371. The choice of noun is a further example of J.’s assimilation of the Bona Dea ceremony to Eastern mystery religions, grottos being prominent in the rites of Dionysus, especially in accounts which presented them as orgies (e.g. Liv. 39.13.8–13; see Nilsson 1957: 61–2, Boyancé 1960–1): the morally sinister connotations of *antrum* in this context thus reinforce J.’s depiction of the Bona Dea ritual as an exercise in debauchery. Prop. 4.9.33 (cited 324n.) might also have been in J.’s mind, though the setting and time of year are different: Brouwer 1989: 372, 400–2.

**329 ‘iam fas est, admitte uiros’**: a shocking inversion of religious protocol: men were strictly excluded from the premises while the rites of Bona Dea were taking place: cf. Cic. *Har. resp.* 8 *earque sacra quae uiri oculis ne imprudentis quidem aspici fas est*, 37. Not only do the women violate these embargos by admitting males, but they represent this as divinely ordained (*fas*); worse, these are let in for the purpose of an indiscriminate sexual orgy. In reality ‘[the women] remain pure in regard to many things, but above all sex, while they perform that holy rite’: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 268e. **admitte uiros**: *admitto* is used of admission to rites (e.g. Liv. 39.13.8 *nec quemquam eo uirum admitti solitum*), but, as a technical term for mating a male with a female animal, also implies that the women look on the men as ‘mere stallions’ (Adams, *LSV* 207). The animal-like quality of the women’s lust, a familiar slur in misogynistic writings (Watson 2003: 385–6) culminates in the literal coupling with an ass (334n.).

**329–34** Choosing one woman to typify all, J. describes her increasingly frantic attempts to get herself a man, starting with the preferred partner (*adulter*) and descending through the social hierarchy, until human

possibilities are exhausted and she must resort to an animal. Her desperate urgency is mirrored in the language, one clause following another in breathless succession, and utilising vocabulary suggesting haste: *properare* (330), *incurritur* (331) and *mora nulla* (333).

**329 dormitat adulter** ‘if her lover is asleep’ (*OLD* s.v. *dormito* a) and hence unavailable: for the reading, see Courtney 1967: 46. The omission of *si* balances [*si*] *abstuleris* in 331. The reference to an *adulter* foreshadows the passage on Clodius (336–41 with nn.).

**330 iuuenem:** presumably the adulterer’s son; cf. Juv. 14.23 with Courtney. **cucullo:** hoods were used to conceal one’s identity when engaged on an extramarital adventure (118n.).

**331 si nihil est** ‘if none of these is available’; cf. 3.112 *horum si nihil est. seruis:* married women who committed adultery with a slave were thought especially culpable, because of the risk of introducing servile blood into the family and because such relationships entailed a degrading inversion of the social hierarchy. See also 279n.

**331–2 abstuleris spem | seruorum, uenit et conductus aquarius:** *aquarii* were slaves or freedmen whose job was to carry water to houses from the aqueducts. Resorting to one of these, even if she has to hire him (*et conductus*), represents a further debasement: the individuals in question were of low status (Weaver 1972: 5), closely associated with prostitutes (Fest. 20 L *aquarioli dicebantur mulierum impudicarum sordidi adseculae*, Apul. *Apol.* 78.1), who seemingly used them to provide a constant supply of water for douching after intercourse: cf. Butrica 1999, McGinn 2004: 37, 152.

**333–4 mora... | ...asello:** lit. ‘there will be no delay on her part to inhibit [retard] her placing her bottom underneath an ass that is put atop her’. *imponere* is used in veterinary language of ‘putting’ the male to the female (Adams, *LSV* 207) and underscores the animal-like nature of the coupling, as does the rear-entry position, described by Lucr. 4.1264 as intercourse *more ferarum*.

**334 clunem:** a politer term for ‘buttocks’ than *nates* (Adams 1981: 239–42), which nonetheless is erotically charged, being often as here associated with sexual movements (Brown on Lucr. 4.1270–1). See also intro. 50. **clunem summittat:** this rear-entry sexual position, where the woman bends over with her buttocks raised in the air, is often depicted on vases and paintings, as well as in ‘humorous’ literature (Brown on Lucr. 4.1263–77), where it is particularly associated with prostitutes and libertine females (cf. Jocelyn 1983, Clarke 1998: 229–30, 2004: 24–7). For an illustration on a lamp of a woman employing it with an ass, see Bruneau 1965: 351 fig. 2. **asello:** poetic for ‘ass’ (Housman, *CP*: 1163–5). The list



of potential lovers comes to a risibly bathetic conclusion with the introduction of zoophilia. The ass was commonly depicted in this context because of the prodigious size of its organ (cf. Apul. *Met.* 3.24, 10.22, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.1), reflected in its close association with the similarly well-endowed Priapus. The degradation of engaging in bestiality is materially enhanced by the low status of the animal partner: the ass was held in very poor esteem (Toynbee 1973: 193–6), occupying the bottom rung on the equid hierarchy; cf. Griffith 2006: 227–9.

**335–6** *atque utinam ritus ueteres et publica saltem* | ... *sacra* ‘would that the ancient rituals, or (*OLD* 13 s.v. *et*) at least the public rites, were conducted uncontaminated by these evils’. By *publica sacra* J. has in mind the Bona Dea rites in particular, which were held *pro populo* (335–6n. below). *saltem* implies an alternative (*OLD* s.v. 1a) in the shape of non-public rites, but what J. has in mind is unclear. Friedländer believed that the contrast is with the *secreta* of 314–34, which he took to refer to *private* rites, holding that the subject of the December Bona Dea festival is introduced for the first time at 335. But he conceded that there is no evidence for such private rites, and, significantly, the Saufeia of line 320 reappears in 9.117, *pro populo faciens* (cf. 320n.). It is better to suppose that *et publica saltem* points a contrast with *unsanctioned* rites (i.e. not *pro populo*), such as those of Dionysus, notorious for debauchery (314–45n.). In any event, the rationale for the couplet is less than clear (cf. Bellandi *ad loc.*, Willis xxx–xxxiii): some have resorted to emendation or excision.

**335** *ritus ueteres*: the Bona Dea ceremony was of great antiquity; cf. Cic. *Har. resp.* 37.

**335–6** *publica* ... | ... *sacra*: though the Bona Dea ceremony in December was held in a private house, it was a state ceremony conducted for the well-being of the Roman people; cf. Cic. *Har. resp.* 12 *sacrificio quod fit pro salute populi Romani*, Brouwer 1989: 254, 359, Staples 1998: 44.

**336** *his* ... *malis*: the sexual promiscuity described above.

**336–41** As evidence of the contamination of the *sacra* by illicit sex, J. alludes to the Bona Dea scandal of December 62 BC, when Clodius, disguised as a harp-girl, entered the house of the Pontifex Maximus, Julius Caesar, during the ceremony, in order to gain access to Caesar’s wife Pompeia. According to Plutarch (*Caes.* 10, *Cic.* 28) the plan was thwarted when the maid of Caesar’s mother Aurelia raised the alarm, and Clodius was ejected and subsequently prosecuted for polluting the rites (cf. Cic. *Pis.* 95, *Har. resp.* 8). It is relevant to the present context that, according to some sources, Clodius was also charged with committing adultery there

(cf. Cic. *Dom.* 105 *non solum aspectu, sed etiam incesto flagitio et stupro caerimoniae polluit*, Vell. Pat. 2.45.1, Sen. *Ep.* 97.2).

**336–7 omnes | nouerunt Mauri atque Indi:** the story is so notorious as to be known world-wide. *Mauri* stands for the extreme West (Plin. *HN* 5.2); *Indi* represents the Eastern boundary (Virg. *G.* 2.122–3 *India...extremi sinus orbis*).

**337 psaltria:** for this disguise assumed by Clodius see Cic. *Har. resp.* 44, Plut. *Cic.* 28, *Caes.* 10.

**337–8 penem | ...Anticatones:** Clodius' penis was (hyperbolically) longer than the two (Suet. *Iul.* 56.5) *Anticato* volumes of Caesar when set end to end, one a reply to Cicero's eulogy of Caesar's enemy Cato (Cic. *Att.* 12.40.1), the other directed against Cato himself (cf. Tschiedel 1981) and self-evidently a byword for their size. For another possibility see Courtney. *penem maiorem* sets up a contrast with the following *testiculus* and amusingly negates *psaltria*.

**339–41** Anything male was rigorously excluded from the ceremony (Cic. *Har. resp.* 8 cited 329n. '*iam fas...uiros*', Juv. 2.83–90, Brouwer 1989: 255), and this included even pictures of masculine animals, which had to be covered (Sen. *Ep.* 97.2). J. takes the embargo one stage further, amusingly imagining a tiny mouse as possessing a human sense of embarrassment at its masculinity and taking to flight. For exclusion of male animals from a ritual for a goddess cf. Paus. 7.27.10.

**339 testiculi:** used with its genuine diminutive force and not, as usual, synonymous with *testis*, especially since the line-ending is reminiscent of Virgil's *saepe exiguus mus* (*G.* 1.181). Even a tiny mouse, with its equally tiny testicles, would offend the goddess. **sibi conscius** 'conscious of', used, as often, of something causing guilt or shame e.g. Prop. 1.15.38 (*nequitiae*), *Caes. B Gall.* 1.14.2 (*iniuriae*). **fugit mus:** the monosyllabic ending, with resultant clash of ictus and accent, throws stress on the final word. This metrical anomaly (cf. Serv. on Virg. *Aen.* 8.83), comparatively frequent in J. (Courtney 51), is humorous in intent, recalling Hor. *Ars P.* 139 *parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus*; it is reinforced by the assonance of *u* (*illuc, testiculi...consciis unde fugit mus | intulerit*).

**340–1 uelari pictura... | ...figuras:** domestic wall paintings of mythical scenes often showed nude males, e.g. the full-frontal image of Ixion in the triclinium of the House of the Vettii at Pompeii (De Carolis 2001: 48; cf. 44, 52–3, 55, 59).

**340 intulerit:** the short *-it* is lengthened in arsis: cf. Val. Flacc. 5.164 *impulerit imas*, Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 4.64.

**342-5** and yet (*et*), even though there was one infamous instance of ritual desecration in the first century BC (Cicero claimed *Har. resp.* 12 and 38 that Clodius' case was unique), in those times (*tunc*) people were not in general contemptuous of religion, in implied contrast to J.'s own day (*sed nunc*) when according to J. – with typical hyperbole – religion is so scorned that every altar is desecrated by someone like Clodius. Contrast Seneca (*Ep.* 97.1-2), who views the Bona Dea scandal as the supreme example of the wickedness which bedevils every age of mankind (cf. Nadeau).

**342** *quis tunc... contemptor numinis?* not only *are* people nowadays, it is implied, contemptuous of the gods, but the termination *-tor* suggests that they make a practice of such behaviour, like Mezentius, *contemptor deorum*.

**343-4** Vessels for ritual use were originally (cf. *Numae*) of earthenware or bronze, such materials being subsequently retained out of religious conservatism: cf. Apul. *Apol.* 18, Plin. *HN* 35.158. In later times earthenware, being cheap, was a symbol of plainness and rusticity (cf. Tib. 1.1.37-8 *adstitis, diui, neu uos e paupere mensa | dona nec e puris spernite fictilibus*), and the unsophisticated past (e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 1.202, Sen. *Ep.* 31.11). To a wealthy Roman, the use of such cheap objects might seem amusingly old-fashioned (*ridere* 343; cf. Liv. 34.4.5 sophisticates *antefixa fictilia deorum Romanorum ridentes*). But since rustic simplicity is closely associated in Roman moralising with a time-honoured piety (Hor. *Epod.* 2.21-2 with Watson), laughing at the former can be equated, as here, with the rejection of religion and the gods.

**343** *simpuium... Numae*: a *simpuium* was a type of ladle used in ritual (Zwierlein-Diehl 1980, Latte 1960: 384, pl. 30). The *simpuium* of Numa, founder of Roman religion, the Vestal priesthood included (Plut. *Num.* 9), stands in general for an archaic vessel; but given the close iconographical association of *simpuium* with the Pontifex Maximus and Vestals, mention of the vessel has particular significance here, since the Clodius scandal took place in the house of the Pontifex Maximus, Caesar, and in the presence of the Vestals. **nigrumque catinum**: the black colour indicates both humbleness and age, cheap black undecorated pottery being common until overtaken in popularity by red in the mid-first century BC: Sparkes 1991: 103-10.

**344** *Vaticano fragiles de monte patellas*: *patellae* are small dishes or plates used for offerings to the gods (*OLD* s.v. 1a). *fragiles*, 'brittle', like *Vaticano* (pottery from the Vatican, noted for its clay, was cheap), suggests poor quality which might provoke the sneers of modern sophisticates. The Vatican district is often spoken of belittlingly (cf. Toynbee and Ward Perkins 1956: 3-23), associations perhaps in play here.

**345 Clodius:** the MSS read *Claudius*, but in alluding to a notorious story it is more appropriate to use the name under which the protagonist is invariably known in sources on the scandal.

**346–8** A shorter version of O29–34. See intro. § 7.

**349–51** *Nowadays the highest and lowest of women are equally lustful.*

In contrast to his usual focus in *Sat.* 6 on upper-class *matronae* and their immorality, J. here tars all women with the same brush, exemplifying *summae* and *minimae* chiastically in 350–1. The thought of 349 is introduced very abruptly – the verse is excised by Ribbeck and Knoche – though it can be argued (assuming the excision of 346–8) that *iamque* connects with *nunc* 345, *libido* with the sexual excesses of the women at the Bona Dea rite and the pervasiveness of female lust across class boundaries with the social inclusiveness of the Bona Dea ceremony as pictured by J. (cf. 320–3). In that sense the lines operate as a coda to 314–45. They do not belong thematically to the following Ogulnia scene, which in any case has its own clearly articulated introductory line.

**350 silicem pedibus quae conterit atrum:** *contero* is used hyperbolically of ‘wearing out’ paving by constant treading: cf. Prop. 2.23.15 *cui saepe immundo Sacra conteritur Via socco*, OLD s.v. 2b. The reference is to a humble woman who must go from place to place under her own steam, in contrast to the rich woman who is carried aloft (cf. 351n.). ‘*silice sternere* is “to pave” generally, with no specific sense attached to the noun... but here *atrum* [refers to]... the basalt which paved many of the streets of Rome: cf. 3.272’ (Courtney); see further Forbes 1993: 151–5. Hendry 1995–6: 257–8 argued that the distinction between *summae* and *minimae* is inadequately expressed by line 350 as it stands, since most women – not just the humblest – would have used their feet to get about; he therefore emended *atrum* to *atris*, which would refer to the unshod, hence ‘dirty’, feet of the very lowest class of women. This presses the logic too hard: J. classes people as either rich or poor, e.g. 3.239–48.

**351** An upper-class woman, borne in a litter, a symbol of wealth and status (309n.). This was equipped with poles (*asserēs*: cf. Juv. 7.132) which rested on the necks (cf. *ceruice*) of the litter-bearers, who were often eight in number. In order to enhance the impressiveness of the spectacle, tall (*longorum*), strapping specimens were preferred (cf. Catull. 10.20 *octo homines parare rectos*), specifications which Syrians met (Mart. 7.53.10 *grandes octo tulere Syr*), whence the regular use of these as *lecticarii* (Mart. 9.2.11 *octo Syris suffulta datur lectica puella* with Henriksén, 9.22.9).

**352–65** *In order to attend the games in a manner befitting her social status, Ogulnia, an impoverished aristocrat, hires all kinds of trappings – yet she gives away*

*to athletes such family silver as remains. Many households endure poverty, but no woman shows a due sense of restraint in the face of this. Men sometimes husband their resources providently. An extravagant woman is blithely unaware of diminishing resources, but, as if these were automatically replenished, goes on spending, never thinking of the cost.*

J. returns to one of his favourite themes, the spendthrift ways of wives, initially focalising the topic through disapprobation of the object of their expenditure, Greek athletes (352–6): women will find money for such purposes even if, like Ogulnia, their circumstances are so reduced that they must hire the status symbols which they can no longer afford. At 357–62 the argument shifts to a general condemnation of female financial irresponsibility, rounded off by the condemnatory *sententia* of 362.

The theme is a stock-in-trade of misogynistic writings. While often it is simply the cost of female expenditure that is objected to (cf. Nicostratus, *On marriage* Stob. 4.595–6, Plaut. *Aul.* 475–536, Columella, *Rust.* 12 *prae*f. 9, Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 313d *multa esse quae matronarum usibus necessaria sunt, pretiosae uestes, aurum, gemmae, sumptus, ancillae, suppellex uaria, lecticae et esseda deaurata*, Watson 2008a: 274 n. 30), sometimes, as here, the emphasis is on the morally dubious purposes to which these expenses are put: cf. ‘Periktione the Pythagorean’ Stob. 4.689–90, Muson. 3 (40 Lutz), ‘Phintys the Pythagorean’ Stob. 4.592.

**352** Women wished to make a fine appearance at the games (Ov. *Ars* 1.99 *spectatum ueniunt, ueniunt spectentur ut ipsae*), but Ogulnia’s circumstances are so depressed that she must hire the necessary accoutrements, amongst which elegant clothing (*uestem*) figured prominently: cf. Tert. *De spect.* 25.2 *immo in omni spectaculo nullum magis scandalum occurret quam et ipse ille mulierum et uirorum accuratior cultus*, Plut. *Cons. uxor.* 608f–609a, Dio Cass. 60.33.3, Herrmann 1992: 93–4. For *conducit*... *uestem* cf. Theoc. *Id.* 2.74, where Simaetha borrows a friend’s fine wrap to attend a procession. **ludos**: J. is thinking particularly of athletic contests, given Ogulnia’s erotic interest in *athletae* (356n.). **Ogulnia**: Ogulnia, who bears a name belonging to an old, noble plebeian *gens* (probably extinct: Ferguson 1987: s.v.), stands for an impoverished aristocrat.

**353**: the breathless asyndeton underscores the sheer number of trappings which have to be hired: cf. Theophr. quoted 352–65n. **conducit comites**: a *matrona* of standing (which is how Ogulnia presents herself) was expected, as a matter of propriety and social dignity, to be attended in public by a retinue of *comites* (Sen. *Controv.* 2.7.3). **sellam**: a sedan chair, used by wealthy women (Sen. *Constant.* 14.1, Tac. *Ann.* 14.4.3, Juv. 1.120–6, *muliebri sella* Suet. *Otho* 6.3), which is what Ogulnia is pretending to be. **ceruical**: ‘perhaps a cushion or padded back in the *sella*, cf. 1.159:

but... more probably... a cushion on which she could sit in the stone seat, cf. *puluino* 3.154, Ov. *Ars* 1.160 Courtney.

**354 nutricem:** the ‘nurse’ is represented as an old family retainer who has remained in the service of Ogulnia, a common practice in upper-class households, where wet-nursing was prevalent: cf. Bradley 1986: 213, 219 and 593n. **flauam...puellam:** a slave-girl from Germany; the reddish-blond hair of Germans was one of the most frequently noted somatic markers of the race (120n.). According to Theophr. *Char.* 22.10 the illiberal man ‘even though his wife brought him a dowry, doesn’t buy her a slave-girl...but rents...a slave to go along with her when she leaves the house’. With her own property almost exhausted (355–6), Ogulnia acts likewise.

**355–6:** despite her parlous financial situation (*tamen*), she expends the last (*nouissima, superest quodcumque*) of her remaining valuables on athletes, with whom she is obsessed. *argenti* is silver plate.

**356 leuibus athleticis:** *leuibus*, ‘smooth-skinned’, refers to a class of athletes intermediate between boys and men, namely ἀγένειοι, lit. ‘the beardless’ (cf. Rieger 1999: 188–9), who participated in Greek-style athletic contests, which became firmly established in Rome during the first century AD and continued thereafter. An illustration of two beardless athletes in an Ostian mosaic suggests that these were found erotically attractive (Newby 2005: 63–4; cf. Mart. 4.28, where Chloe is *glabraria*, ‘prey [financially] to a smooth skin’ in the person of *tener Lupercus*). Underlying 355–6 is an implication that *leues athletae* are an unworthy subject to spend one’s remaining cash on. See further intro. 45. **donat:** it is strongly implied that the gifts are in return for sexual favours, as in Mart. 4.28: cf. Tert. *De spect.* 22.2 *quadrigarios, scaenicos, xysticos* (athletes), *arenarios illos amantissimos, quibus...feminae...etiam corpora sua substernunt*.

**357 res angusta domi:** the phrase (cf. Juv. 3.165, Cic. *Part. or.* 112 *angustiae rei familiaris*) captures the essence of the following *paupertas* – not destitution, but straitened circumstances: cf. Kay on Mart. 11.32, Scamuzzi 1966: 188–200. **nulla:** typically essentialising misogyny; cf. 242–3, 379–80.

**357–9 pudorem | paupertatis...nec...|...haec posuitque modum:** for a number of reasons (Kaster 2005: 50–1) lack of means was widely regarded as shameful (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.23–4, Liv. 34.4.13, Sen. *Thy.* 924–5). But since ‘no woman’ feels (culturally sanctioned) ‘shame at’ *paupertas* (*OLD pudor* 1a), she likewise does not feel the *temperantia* of which *pudor* is a subset (Cic. *Invent. rhet.* 2.164) and so spends without regard to proper measure. For *nec...modum* cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.98 *metiri se quemque suo modulo ac*

*pede uerum est* and Juv. 11.35, though the advice to live within one's limitations is here given a more particular cast by specifying a limiting factor, *paupertas*.

**359 modum** 'limit', often combined in this sense with *ponere*. **tamen** 'all the same', introduces a contrast between the sense of financial responsibility exercised by some males and the financial irresponsibility of all women (357–9). See also 360n.

**360 aliquando**: men 'sometimes' look to the future. The thought is of a piece with the following *quidam*, 'some men' [take forethought], and contrasts with unconditional *nulla* 357. Courtney's joining of *tamen* and *aliquando* ('they take a long time to do it, yet eventually they do so') vitiates this coherence. **frigusque famemque**: a common alliterative combination, amplified by *formica*.

**361 formica...magistra**: the ant, by collecting food to tide it over the winter, became a symbol of prudent forethought: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.33–5, Virg. *Aen.* 4.402–3 *ac uelut ingentem formicae farris aceruum | cum populant hiemes memores tectoque reponunt* with Pease, Sauvage 1970: 293–6. **expauere**: gnomic perfect.

**363–4**: a mixed metaphor. Both *recidiuus* (preferable to *rediuuius*), which literally refers to seeds that fall from a tree or plant and sprout up again, and *pullulare*, 'send forth new growth', are agricultural terms (Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 10.58, Nettleship 1889: 567–8), while *aceruus* is used of a pile of grain plundered by ants (361n.); conversely, *arca* refers to a money-chest of which, when emptied (*exhausta*), the contents miraculously regenerate, reminiscent of the folkloric motif of the inexhaustible purse (Thompson 1956: 233).

**364 et...aceruo**: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.51 *at suaue est ex magno tollere aceruo*.

**365 quanti...constent** 'how much their pleasures cost'; *quanti* is genitive of price. *gaudia* probably has a sexual colour (cf. 356n., Adams, *LSV* 197–8): J. likes to use the term in *Sat.* 6 of dubious enjoyments (Ferguson).

**O1–34** *Wherever a professed queer is established, you will find everyone else like him. They pollute the vessels from which they drink – which the wife gets washed and reused! Even gladiatorial trainers run a purer establishment, careful to separate the manly from the effeminate. But your spouse makes you share a cup with persons with whom even the most degraded of whores would decline to drink. Wives follow their advice in all manner of things, learning from them sexy dances and other things besides. But such persons are not always to be trusted. The more effeminate they appear, the more likely they are to turn out he-men in bed. It's no good advising*

*husbands to keep their wife under the watchful eye of guards. The adulterous wife seduces these first to secure their complicity.*

Lines O<sub>1</sub>–34, along with 373A–B, are found in a single MS of Juvenal held in Oxford, whence the designation ‘O’. On the textual and transmissional problems raised by these lines, the so-called ‘Oxford fragment’, see intro. § 7.

**O<sub>1</sub> in quacumque domo uiuit:** the arch-*cinaedus* of 1–2 is one of the sexual undesirables whom, according to Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 314b, a wife will install in the household, regardless of her husband’s wishes (cf. O<sub>14</sub>–16); cf. also Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 33 (O<sub>6n</sub>). **luditque** ‘disports himself’, probably, in this sexualised context, with reference primarily to erotic play (cf. Juv. 7.239 *ne turpia ludant* [puer], Adams, *LSV* 162–3). Bellandi, while viewing the word as polysemous, privileges the idea of dancing (cf. O<sub>19</sub>, O<sub>26</sub>): *cinaedus* literally signifies ‘dancer’; cf. *lusor mutus* CIL VI 4886 of a *pantomimus*.

**O<sub>1</sub>–2 professus | obscenum** ‘a professional queer’, *obscenus* being as often used with specific reference to the *cinaedus*: cf. Liv. 33.28.5, Juv. 2.9 *tristibus obscenis. profiteor* means ‘make a profession of, make a practice of’ (*OLD* s.v. 4a): cf. Sen. *Prov.* 5.3 *in urbe securos esse praecisos et professos impudiciam*, *Script. physiogn.* I 162 *praestigias profitebatur. obscenum* is neuter substantive (not masculine with *se* understood): many neuter adjectives, esp. of the 2nd decl., are used as substantives, particularly in nom. and acc., primarily to express moral or evaluative ideas (cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 411 *num iniquom postulo?*, Tac. *Ann.* 3.70 *quod... egregium publicum... dehonestauisset*, K–S 1.228–9, Draeger 1878: 53).

**O<sub>2</sub>** The line as transmitted is unmetrical. The suggestion of von Winterfeld 1899: 794 *et tremula promittens omnia dextra* is superior to Housman’s *tremula promittit et*: there are doubts as to the propriety of postponing *et* to the third word in its clause (Courtney). **tremula... dextra:** Sen. *Ep.* 52.12 *impudicum* (pathic) ... *ostendit... manus mota*, *Script. physiogn.* I 34 one of the signs of the *cinaedus* is ‘movements of the hands... which are supine and effeminate’ (ἐκλυτοί), II 76. **promittens omnia:** by his overtly queer gestures (prev. n.) he promises unlimited sexual possibilities. Cf. *Script. physiogn.* II 58 *hunc dicit impatientia libidinum quae turpia sunt omnia passum esse*, Petron. 81.4, Lucian, *Rhet. praeept.* 23 (of an effeminate) ‘and let your mouth itself be open for everything indiscriminately (πρὸς ἅπαντα ὁμοίως) and let your tongue serve both your speeches and everything else that it can’, Housman *ad loc.*

**O<sub>3</sub>** seems to mean that the *cinaedus* fills the house with like-minded individuals, or possibly that his obscene ways taint the morals of everyone else



in the house (cf. Apul. *Apol.* 75 *domus eius tota lenonia, tota familia contaminata*). **omnes turpes similesque cinaedis**: disciples and fellow-travellers of the arch-*cinaedus* of O<sub>1</sub>–2. *turpis* – like αἰσχροῦς a generic term for what is sexually debased – is regularly used with specific reference to male homosexuals (e.g. Juv. 2.83 *nemo repente fuit turpissimus*, 7.239, Sen. *Vit. beat.* 13.3 *turpi patientiae*). Since *his* (O<sub>4</sub>), which picks up *omnes turpes similesque cinaedis* O<sub>3</sub>, can only refer to *cinaedi*, given the allusion in O<sub>4</sub>–6 to their characteristic practice of oral sex, it is counter-intuitive to treat *omnes* as feminine, as several commentators do. **similesque cinaedis** ‘as good as *cinaedi*’, κιναιδῶδεις. *similis* with the dative noun here resembles the epic use of ἴσος or *similis* with a dative participle: in both cases near or total equivalence is indicated.

**O<sub>4</sub>–5 his uiolare cibos... | permittunt**: *his* are the camp-followers of O<sub>3</sub>. *uiolare cibos sacraeque adsistere mensae* form a virtual hendiadys (both *uiolare* and *sacrae* are religious terms: cf. Sen. *Ep.* 97.2). *J.* apparently means that the effeminate profane the sacred board by their filthy presence (cf. *Script. physiogn.* 1130 *non interfuisse epulis uel conuiuio cuiquam quod non foedis et impuribus rebus polluisset*): the table and the food upon it are sacred (Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 279e, *Quaest. conv.* 704b). If a more specific explanation is sought for *uiolare cibos*, the sense is that the *cinaedi* pollute the communal foodstuffs (cf. Mart. 3.17.1–2) with their touch: since in eating their fingers brush their mouths, which are impure (O<sub>5n.</sub>), they defile the food when they next lay a hand upon it.

**O<sub>5</sub> permittunt**: as O<sub>14</sub> makes clear, the reference is to wives. By allowing *cinaedi* to share the meal, the wife inflicts pollution on the other diners: cf. Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.16 *tractauit [sc. eam] impuram esse... quae cibum cum impuris ceperit*. **uasa iubent frangenda lauari**: as part of their female persona, *cinaedi* were assumed to practise oral (i.e. non-penetrative, hence unmasculine) sex (cf. *CIL* IV 1825 *Cosmus Equitaes Magnus cinaedus et fel-lator: esuris apertis maribus*, Lucian, *Rhet. praecept.* 23 (*omnia* O<sub>2n.</sub>), Richlin 1992: 26–9), thereby contaminating any vessels from which they drank (Sen. *Ben.* 2.21.5, Kay on Mart. 11.11.3): these accordingly ought to be broken as unfit for further use (Mart. 12.74.10, *Anth. Pal.* 11.39). But instead of ordering them to be disposed of, the wives order them to be washed and recycled – an instance of the imperiousness of wives, who rule the roost while the husbands must tamely submit (cf. *permittunt* O<sub>5</sub>, O<sub>7</sub>, O<sub>14</sub>–16).

**O<sub>6</sub>** The meaning of both *colocyntha* and *barbata chelidon*, instances of Greek used derisively, is deeply contentious, but *uasa... frangenda... cum... bibit* puts it beyond doubt that the reference in both cases is to *ore polluti*, viz. *cinaedi*. Of course women too practise oral sex (O<sub>14</sub>–16n.), but the vice is

particularly associated with effeminates, and it is they who are the almost exclusive focus of O1–6. Consequently the view that either *chelidon* (Todd 1943: 109) or *colocyntha* (Maas 1899: 419) designates a female may be discounted. **colocyntha**: a transliteration of κολοκύνθη, equivalent to Latin *cucurbita*, ‘gourd’, also known by the name σικύα, which has a botanical relative σικυός (Porphyrio ad Hor. *Ars P.* 52–3, *CGL* II 352.35, III 265.38, III 207.65, II 431.28–9). As just noted, the reference must be to a *cinaedus*. How a *cinaedus* might be likened disparagingly to a ‘gourd’ is suggested by Theopomp. fr. 76 K–A ‘she has become softer (μαλακωτέρα) than a ripe σικυός’ and Marcell. Empir. 1.106. *colocynthidos, id est cucurbitae, quod habet interius molle*, said with reference to the watery softness which characterises many *cucurbitaceae* (Petron. 39.12, Gargil. Mart. *Med.* 6). Softness (*mollities*, μαλακία) was the defining characteristic of the *cinaedus* (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 11.23–4), while ὑγρός, ‘moist’, is one of a number of terms for the *cinaedus* in Poll. *Onom.* 6.126. Also of note is Plato Com. fr. 65.4 K–A ‘a ripe eunuch σικυός’ (σικυοῦ πέπονος εὐνουχίου). If a seedless σικυός was called ‘eunuch’, this too might trigger an association between *cucurbitae* and *cinaedi*, in the sense that eunuchs were seen as sexual inverts *par excellence* (513–15nn.): Norrman and Haarberg 1980: 56 in fact propose that *colocyntha* here stands for an emasculated man. Another suggestion is that *colocyntha* stands for a grossly phallic, salacious person (Todd 1943: 108–11), but the argument is tenuous and penetrative sex quite out of place in a context stigmatising effeminates, who play the receptive rôle. Also unpersuasive is Housman’s suggestion (*CP* 482 and *ad loc.*) that, as the σικύα was inserted into the female genitalia to address gynaecological complaints, *colocyntha* stands for the mouth of a *cunnilingus*; likewise unconvincing is the convoluted argument of Eden 1985: 337–8. **barbata chelidon**: like *colocyntha*, a nickname for a *cinaedus*. *Chelidon* was *unus ex Cleopatrae mollibus* (Sen. *Ep.* 87.16: cf. Suda s.v. χελιδόνας) and *Chelidonion*, ‘Little Swallow’, a *cinaedus* who lived in the household of a luxury-inclined, aristocratic woman (Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 33) and ‘twittered’ (τερετίζοντος). It seems likely that a perceived resemblance between the twittering, womanish (O23n.) voices of *cinaedi* and the ‘twittering’ of the swallow (Hsch. s.v. τερετίζω, τραυλίζουσα χελιδονίς *IG* xiv 1934f.7, *Anth Pal.* 10.4.5, *Anth. Plan.* 141.1) gave rise to the disparaging antonomasia. Likewise relevant perhaps, in the domestic setting of O1–6, is the Pythagorean proverb ‘do not receive a swallow into the house’. *barbata* is a surprise with *chelidon*: *cinaedi* were usually beardless (Herter, *RAC* IV 633 s.v. *effeminatus*). But some sported beards: cf. Mart. 7.58.1–2, Cic. *Cat.* 2.22–3, Plaut. *Cas.* 465–6, Lucil. 1058 Marx *barbati moechocinaedi*, a similar paradox to here. Housman’s oft-reproduced explanation of *barbata chelidon* (*CP* 482 and *ad loc.*), that it refers to the mouth of a *fellator*, which is likened to a *cun-nus*, for which χελιδών is sexual slang (Ar. *Lys.* 770–6, Suda s.v. χελιδόνας),

does admittedly give a specific physiological referent to *barbata* (cf. *barbato* at *Priap.* 12.14 of pubic hair in the vaginal area), but seems impossibly far-fetched. And in any case the point of *barbata* may be a contrast with the typically smooth appearance of a colocynth in both its vegetative and cinaedic manifestations.

**O7–13** The lines are desperately difficult and corrupt, and no interpretation entirely satisfactory. But the general sense is clear: the keeper of the gladiatorial barracks (*lanista*) maintains a less polluted establishment (*purior*) than yours, because he carefully segregates (*longe migrare iubetur*) the more manly (*euphono* or *euhoplo*) from the more effeminate (*psellus* or *psilus*) gladiators: moreover (*quid quod* Ogn.), he distinguishes between the ordinary *retiarius* (*retia*, *munimenta umeri*, *tridentem*, *qui nudus pugnare solet* nn.) and the *retiarum tunicati* (*turpi*...|...*tunicae*: for discussion of the meaning of this phrase see below). These last, along with their equipment, are housed in a separate part of the *ludus* (*nec retia turpi | iunguntur tunicae*, *nec cella ponit eadem* etc.). Your wife, by contrast, makes you share table and cups with her *cinaedi*.

So much for the overall thrust of the passage. But two specific problems bedevil its interpretation.

- (1) At O9, the MS reads the nonsensical *psillus* and *eupholio*. Two emendations in particular could yield the required sense, that the *lanista* avoids pollution of his barracks by keeping effeminate gladiators segregated from the manly others:
  - (a) Housman's *psellus* ('weak-voiced')...*euphono* ('loud-voiced'): *psellus* (ψελλός lit. 'speaking falteringly') would refer to the feeble speech of effeminates (cf. Plat. *Gorg.* 485b–c 'when ever one hears a man speaking falteringly (ψελλιζομένου)... it appears...unmanly', RAC iv 636 s.v. *effeminatus*), *euphonos* (εὐφωνος) to loud, clear, manly tones (cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 713, Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.20).
  - (b) *psilus* (Vianello, Colin 1952–3: 344)...*euhoplo*. The pair would allude to the effeminate vs the manly, *psilus* in the sense 'smooth' referring to the effeminate's practice of depilating himself (O23–4n.), while *euhoplo*, with the metaphorical meaning 'well-endowed' (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 592 for εὐοπλος used thus and Henderson 1991: 123 for ὀπλον of the penis), would signify a virile, masculine type. These readings also, however, involve a *double entendre*, *psilus* in the sense 'light-armed' (*LSJ* s.v. ψιλός) being opposed to *euhoplos*, 'heavy-armed', referring to different classes of gladiator: respectively, the *retiarius* (see O12n.) and the heavier-armed fighters such as the *hoplomachus* or *Thrax*. There are serious problems with this approach, which has nonetheless attracted much

support. First, the ‘light-armed’ gladiator, viz. the *retiarius*, represents the undesirable effeminate in O8–9 but in O9–13 is contrasted favourably with the *retiarius tunicatus*. This is awkward, to say the least. More importantly, the reading *psilus* hinges on the assumption that *retiarum* in general were regarded as effeminate or inferior to other gladiators (see most recently Carter 2008). But there is no clear evidence for this (indeed Morgan 2010: 94 n. 131 offers the intriguing suggestion that a taunt aimed by the *retiarius* at the heavy-armed *murmillio* may have imputed effeminacy to the latter). Two pieces of evidence brought to bear by those arguing for the effeminacy of *retiarum* can be discounted: (i) in *Sat.* 8, J. attacks the effeminate Gracchus who fights as a *retiarius*, not being prepared to show manliness by using a sword, but the attack is occasioned more by his cowardly behaviour and especially the fact that his lack of a helmet displays his face to the crowd (disgraceful for an upper-class man); the passage does not prove that *retiarum* in general were considered effeminate; (ii) Colin 1952–3: 345, followed by Gunderson 1996, refers to an inscription set up for a *retiarius* by two male friends, all three of whom have names that suggest effeminacy: Thelonicus (Θηλύνω, ‘make womanish’), Xustus (ξυστός, ‘shaved’) and Pepticius (πέπτω, ‘soften’), but this only shows that *some* were effeminate, and would in fact support Housman’s hypothesis (discussed below) that a distinction is being made in O9–12 between manly and effeminate *retiarum*.

A refinement of reading (b) is *psyllus* (Postgate 1899) ... *euhoplo*. *psyllus* is derived from a passage in Charisius which gives the word as a synonym for *effeminatus*; however, it is a Renaissance emendation and thus unreliable: see Courtney. Again, *psilus* (‘stripped of hair, smooth’) coupled with *euhoplo* (‘well-endowed’) could certainly stand for ‘effeminate’ vs ‘manly’, but does not create the marked antithesis that line O9 calls for (and other emendations supply). In view of the above-noted difficulties we opt for *psellus* ... *euphono* as the best solution currently on offer.

- (2) The meaning of *turpi* ... | ... *tunicae* O9–10. Most of our information on *retiarum tunicati* (for an illustration see Dunkle 2008: fig. 18) comes from Juvenal, *Sat.* 2.143–8 and 8.199–210, where a tunic-clad (2.143, 8.207) Gracchus – stigmatised in 2.117–32 as an effeminate – fights unsuccessfully in the arena as a *retiarius*, sporting the distinctive armament of that class, trident and net (2.143, 8.203; 2.148, 8.204). Given his illustrious lineage (2.145–8, 8.199–210), Gracchus can only be an amateur of the profession (as five *retiarum tunicati* who yield

without a fight at Suet. *Calig.* 30.3 may also be). In the light of this, Owen 1905, Cerutti and Richardson 1989 and Dunkle 110–11 have seen in *turpi... | ... tunicae* a reference to freeborn amateurs (*auctorati*), who incur disgrace by offering their services in the arena: cf. Sen. *Ep.* 37.1–2 where the oath sworn by *auctorati* is called *turpissimum*, also Tac. *Ann.* 15.32 *feminarum illustrium senatorumque plures per arenam foedati sunt*. But it seems a fatal objection to this understanding of *turpi* that it involves separation (O9–13) on grounds of status rather than sexuality: not an appropriate lead-in to the following lines (*sed tibi communem calicem...*), where a definite contrast is implied between the avoidance of sexual pollution in the gladiatorial *ludus* and threat of pollution from the *os impurum* of the *cinaedi* in the woman's household (on the same basis *tunicae* cannot, with Colin 1952–3: 352, intimate that the *tunicati* are criminals). In other words, it seems inconceivable that *turpi* refers to anything other than sexual debasement, as at O3. It is therefore better to assume with Housman (*ad loc.*; cf. *CP* 540) that – in contrast to the ordinary *retiarii* – the *tunicati* are effeminate. In support of this he pointed to Sen. *QNat.* 7.31.3 *alius genitalia excidit, alius in obscenam ludi partem fugit et, locatus ad mortem, infame † armatur egenus†* (*armaturae genus* Housman) *etiam in quo morbum suum exerceat, legit*: this – irrespective of whether his emendation is accepted – clearly establishes that effeminate gladiators were housed in a separate part of the *ludus*, which fits the present context admirably. This said, it is unfortunate that there is no mention of tunics in the Senecan parallel, nor is the wearing of tunics in general associated with effeminacy.

**O7** Thanks to your wife (cf. *tuis*), even the *lanista*, manager of a gladiatorial school, operates a cleaner establishment than yours: a startling paradox, since the profession of *lanista* was of very low status (Kyle 1998: 84, 109 n. 48, Dunkle 2008: 31). *lanista* is short for *lanistae lares purior* (i.e. less polluted) alludes to the oral pollution believed to afflict practitioners of *fellatio* and capable of being passed on by drinking from the same cup: cf. O5n. and 51n., Mart. 3.82 (O14–16n.).

**O8** *numero* 'troupe', in place of the unmetrical *familia* (for the term cf. Ville 1981: 61).

**O9–13** *quid quod... neruos*: J. makes two interrelated points here: (1) the nets (*retia* stands for *retiarii*) are not joined with the 'disgraceful tunic' (*tunica* = *tunicati*), i.e. *retiarii* and *tunicati* are kept separated within the barracks, nor (2) does 'he who fights naked' store his shoulder guard and trident in the same *cella* [as the *tunicatus* does], these persons (*has animas*) being relegated to a far part of the barracks. In saying that the *retiarius*

keeps his gear separate from that of the *tunicatus*, J. draws an implied comparison with the housewife, who fails to keep the ‘equipment’ of the feast – the drinking vessels and food containers – separate from those used by the *cinaedi*. It is important for understanding of the lines to realise that *retia*, *munimenta umeri*, *tridentem*, *qui nudus pugnare solet* all refer to the distinctive accoutrement of the *retiarius*, which eases somewhat the difficulty, which troubles Reeve 1973: 125 and Willis 1989: 459–60, that *nec cella ponit eadem* lacks a phrase like ‘as X’ to complete the sense.

**O<sub>9</sub> quid quod:** lit. ‘what of the fact that?’, introduces an additional point (see 45–6n.), which further tells against the reading *psilus*: since this involves the equation of the ‘light-armed’ with the *retiarii* (see O<sub>7</sub>–13n.), *quid quod* would have, anomalously, to lead into an illustration of the preceding point, rather than a fresh, if related one.

**O<sub>10</sub>–12 nec cella ponit eadem | ... | ...solet?** it appears that at least four gladiators, plus their equipment, were packed into each room of the barracks (Coleman 2005: 6–7), but care is here exercised that *retiarii* and *tunicati* are not billeted together, i.e. they are not, in gladiatorial parlance, συγκελλάριοι.

**O<sub>11</sub> munimenta umeri:** a bronze shoulder-guard or *galerus*, as it is conventionally but perhaps wrongly known (Junkelmann 2008: 81), attached to the *retiarius*’ left arm from shoulder to elbow, for protection in the absence of a shield. Incorporating a flange which extended beyond the shoulder and curved outwards in its upper half, the *galerus* protected not just the shoulder and upper arm, but also the neck and head. See Dunkle 2008: 107–8, K–E 59–61 and Junkelmann 2008: 81–2 with his illustrations 127, 196 (modern re-enactment) and 197. †**pulsatamque arma**†: numerous emendations have been suggested (cf. Laudizi 1982: 56–9), of which the most attractive is *pulsatoremque* (Leo 1909: 601–2, who compared Sil. 13.376 *bellatorem ensem* for a *nomen agentis* in -or used adjectivally with a noun), meaning presumably ‘for thrusting’ or ‘for striking’. Braund’s *pulsatorisque* (*pulsator* = a type of gladiator; cf. Colin 1952–3: 372) involves making the subject of *ponit* the *lanista* rather than *qui nudus pugnare solet*: ‘nor does he (the *lanista*) store in the same *cella* the shoulder guards and the trident of the gladiator who is accustomed to fight *nudus*’. This has the advantage of making explicit the *lanista*’s exercising segregation within his establishment, in sharp contrast to the *matrona*’s practice, but the identification of the *retiarius* as ‘a gladiator’ seems superfluous. See also Griffith 1963: 113–14. **tridentem:** the characteristic weapon of the *retiarius*, along with his *rete*.

**O<sub>12</sub> qui nudus pugnare solet?** a *retiarius* could be described as *nudus*, ‘lightly clothed’, because he was clad only in a loin-cloth (cf. Dunkle 2008:

110 and fig. 18), and apart from his shoulder-guard wore none of the protective armour used by other gladiators. Here, though, *nudus* primarily effects a contrast with the *retiarius tunicatus*.

**O13 has animas:** for the use cf. Virg. *Aen.* 11.372 *uiles animae*. **aliusque in carcere neruōs:** Housman's emendation (cf. *CP* 482) of O's nonsensical *aliosque... neruos*. For J.'s use of the nom. sing. form in -ōs cf. 10.136 *captiuos*, 8.100, 13.50. The *neruus* was an implement used originally to confine the neck, later the feet (Allen 1896: 46–52, 62–4). *alius* ('a different') seems to imply that both the *tunicati* and the ordinary *retiarii* were chained, in separate prison cells. But although prisons formed part of the barracks at Pompeii for instance (see Coleman 2005: 8), there is no clear evidence that they were used to contain anyone other than criminals and other gladiators in need of special chastisement (Dunkle 2008: 43, Kyle 1996: 84).

**O14–16** resumes and amplifies 5–6. Your wife makes you share a cup with individuals so orally polluted that even the lowest of whores, who made a speciality of *fellatio* (cf. Mart. 11.61.2 *Summemmianis iniquationis buccis* with Kay), would decline to share a drink with them, even if the wine were of the finest. J. develops the thought of Mart. 3.82.1–4 *conuiuia quisquis Zoili [a fellator] potest esse, | Summemmianas cenet inter uxores | curtaque Leda sobrius bibat testa. | hoc esse leuius puriusque contendo*.

**O14 communem calicem:** for the expression cf. Juv. 8.177. While at a Roman banquet wine and water could be mixed in a *crater* for communal consumption, it was more usual for these to be mixed for each drinker in an individual cup (Dunbabin 1993). In that case the reference here is to the *propinatio*, in which one drank from a cup then immediately passed it to another (cf. W–W on Mart. 3.82.25 and 8.6.13).

**O15–16:** the whore would reject even a sip (*OLD* sv. *degustare* 1) from the same vessel as the *cinaedi*, a refusal the more striking given not only the excellence of the wines, but the bibulousness of low-class prostitutes (Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.761–8).

**O15 Albanum:** a wine of high quality (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.11.2) awarded the third prize after Caecuban and Falernian by Pliny (*HN* 14.64). **Surrentinumque:** another vintage wine, ranked by Pliny (*ibid.*) in the same class as Alban; cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.710.

**O16:** a so-called Golden Line – highly ironic, given the subject-matter. **flaua:** as was common among *meretrices*, she wears a blond wig (120n.). **ruinosi lupa... sepulchri:** tombs were used as improvised brothels by common prostitutes: cf. Mart. 1.34.8 *abscondunt spurcas et monumenta lupo*, Mart. 3.93.15 *bustuarias moechas*, McGinn 2004: 30 n. 116. **ruinosi:** the

where is so degraded that she frequents not just tombs, but dilapidated ones. There may be an implication that her physical state mirrors the deteriorated condition of the sepulchre: cf. the insulting designation of elderly women as a ‘tomb’ (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 8.12). **lupa**: a word from everyday speech indicating the lowest type of prostitute (Adams 1983a: 334–5).

**O17** for such impetuous marriages and divorces (*subitae* goes with both verbs) cf. 224–30, 229–30n. As so often in *Sat.* 6, J. slips from criticism of an individual wife (O14) into generalisations about the behaviour of women as a whole.

**O18** **his languentem animum reserant et seria vitae** ‘to these they open their hearts in moments of melancholy and reveal the deepest concerns of their life’ (Axelson 1939: 45). *reserant* is Axelson’s suggestion for the MS’s *servant*, strenuously rejected by Housman, but accepted by many (i.e. ‘for these they reserve ...’). Housman’s own suggestion, *soluunt* or *relevant* (‘with their help they relieve the ennui of their souls and find freedom from their worries’) is highly implausible. Watt 2002: 301, picking up Courtney’s remark that *reserant* goes less well with *seria*, suggests *sociant*, but his parallels are all of sharing a thing with another, not of sharing secrets, the sense required here. **languentem**: with ennui (Axelson) or depression (Braund). Bellandi takes the line as a whole to refer to women’s love affairs, their main preoccupation, and a subject on which they elsewhere consult extraneous and dubious characters (589–91): cf. *languenti corde* of the lovesick Ariadne at Catull. 64.99. **reserant...seria uitae**: cf. Val. Fl. 2.438 *hospitibus reserans secreta* and for the noun phrase Juv. 13.21 *incommoda uitae*.

**O19** **his...discunt...magistris**: cf. Philo, *Spec. leg.* 3.39, where the *cinaedus* is ‘an instructor in and teacher (διδάσκαλος) ... of effeminacy and softness’. What the *cinaedi* teach the wives is a highly erotic dance. ‘*kinaidos*... primarily signifies an effeminate dancer who... adopted a lascivious style, often suggestively wiggling his buttocks’ (Williams 2010: 193–4; cf. *CGL* v 654.7 *cynedi, qui publicae clunem agitant, idest saltatores uel pantomimi* and the bronze figurine in Colin 1952–3: fig. a, p. 334): motions which *cinaedi*, in the transferred sense of effeminates, replicated in daily life (Petron. 23.3.3, *Script. physiogn.* I 34, I 416, II 123). **clunem atque latus...uibrare** ‘to shimmy their bottoms and hips’. Cf. *Priap.* 27.2 *uibratas docta mouere nates*, Sen. *QNat.* 7.32.3 *mares inter se uxoresque contenduntur uter det latus mollius* (pantomimic dances in private houses), Mart. 5.78.26–8, *TLL* VII 2.1027.56–65 (*latus* of sinuous dance movements), Fear 1991. Dancing – much less dancing of a sexually arousing type – was not a respectable occupation for a *matrona* (Gibson on Ov. *Ar.* 3.349–80) and was in general regarded as vicious by the Romans (Corbeill 1996: 135–9).



**clunem:** an erotically coloured term (334n.), also one of a number of words employed in the poetic singular which should properly be used in the plural (K–S 185–6).

**O20 quicquid...scit qui docet:** for one such *doctor* of unwholesome arts, cf. *Script. physiogn.* 1160–4.

**O20–2 haud...|...|...reticulatus adulter:** appearances are not always to be trusted (cf. *Sat.* 2.8 *frontis nulla fides*, in a sexual context which is the exact opposite of the present one): a person who looks the very image of an effeminate may turn out to be an adulterer, a *moechocinaedus* (Lucil. 1058 Marx). For such misleading individuals cf. Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 314B, Mart. 10.40, Corbeill 1997: 110–23, Clarke 1998: pl. 14, 229–35. According to Cael. Aurel. *Chron.* 4.132 in some cases <*cinaedi*> *repente mutati paruo tempore uirilitatis quaerunt indicia demonstrare*, plunging into heterosexual excesses: cf. Schrijvers 1985: 28–30.

**O21 oculos fuligine pascit:** first of five stereotypical markers of effeminated males (cf. Sen. *Controv.* 5.6, Apul. *Met.* 8.27), this refers to painting the eyelashes and the eyelids beneath them (cf. Plin. *HN* 11.154 *palpebrae* ‘eyelashes’ OLD s.v. b) *mulieribus fuco etiam infectae cotidiano: tanta est decoris affectatio ut tinguantur oculi quoque*, Ath. 529a ὑπεγέγραπτο τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς) with a powder made of soot (Juv. 2.93–5 *fuligine...|...pingitque tremantes* | *attollens oculos* with Courtney), as women did (Olson 2008: 62). The object was to enhance the beauty of the eyes (Joseph. *BJ* 4.561) by making them seem larger (OLD s.v. *pasco* 4b, Plin. *HN* 33.102), large eyes being accounted beautiful (145n.).

**O22 discinctus croceis:** *cinaedi* affected brightly-hued female clothing (Richlin 1992–3: 542), a saffron-coloured robe (*croceis* sc. *uestibus*, κροκωτός) being a garment of choice (Araros, fr. 4 K–A ‘he looks like an unmarried girl, since he’s wearing saffron-dyed robes and women’s clothing’, Apul. *Met.* 8.27, Virg. *Aen.* 9.614–16). *discinctus* ‘ungirt in’ (Edwards 1993: 83) is more pointed than O’s *distinctus*, ‘embellished by’: to wear loose-fitting clothing was synonymous with effeminacy (Sen. *Ep.* 114.4, Dio Cass. 43.43.1–4, Richlin 542 n. 45), as with loose morals generally (Ov. *Ars* 1.421 with Hollis). **reticulatus adulter:** a paradox of the type *moechocinaedus* (O20–2n.) or *spado moechus* (366–78n.). The *reticulum*, so called because it *capillum contine* [bat] in the manner of a *rete* (Varro, *Ling* 5.130), was a *tegmen capitis muliebre* (Non. 869L, Boëls-Janssen 1993: 77–8, Heras 2010a: 106–8; Hemelrijk 1999: pl. 2 for an illustration), often worn as here by effeminates (Juv. 2.96, SHA *Heliogab.* 11.7, Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 33).

**O<sub>23</sub> quanto uox mollior** ‘the more womanish-sounding the voice’: *quanto* and *quo* correlate with *tanto* understood with *suspectus*. *cinaedi* affected feminised, seductive tones (Phaedr. App. 8.20 *uoce molli*, Script. physiogn. II 58 *uocem femineam*, Sen. Controv. 1 praef. 8), a mincing mode of speech stigmatised as *fracta* or the like (Script. physiogn. II 135, Phaedr. App. 8.2, Juv. 2.111 with Courtney).

**O<sub>23</sub>–4 quo | ...lumbis**: *lumbi* is used with some vagueness of the groin region (Adams, LSV<sub>48</sub>), which is ‘soft’ but also ‘effeminate’ (OLD s.v. *tener* 7), because *cinaedi* depilated it (Juv. 8.16 *si tenerum attritus ... pumice lumbum*, Gell. 6.12.5, Richlin 1992–3: 551 n. 69), absence of body hair being seen as characteristically feminine (Watson on Hor. Epod. 12.5). Keeping one’s hand in one’s groin seems to be a signifier of invert elsewhere only at Anth. Lat. 689b.13 Riese (though Quint. Inst. 11.3.122 comes close to saying the same thing).

**O<sub>25</sub> erit**: idiomatic, ‘will turn out to be’: for this usage cf. Ov. Am. 1.2.7 *sic erit* with McKeown, K–S 1.142. **fortissimus** ‘a real he-man’: cf. Petron. 9.9–10 *qui ne tum quidem, cum fortiter faceres, cum pura muliere pugnasti*, Ov. Am. 2.10.28.

**O<sub>25</sub>–6 exuit ... | ... Triphallo** ‘there Thais danced by (dat. of agent) a skilful Triphallus doffs his mask’: a figurative way of saying that in bed (*illic*) the *cinaedus*/dancer, regarded as effeminate because in pantomime men played female rôles (*Thais*; 63n.), sheds his female persona to reveal himself as ultra-virile, *Triphallus* being an epithet (Herter 1932: 175) of the massively endowed god Priapus (*tri* = ‘thrice’ i.e. ‘extremely’). *persona* is literally the mask which the actor wore in the pantomime (Lucian, Salt. 29, 63, 66, Jory 2001). *Thais* is puzzling (Willis 1989: 462–3), because the female rôles in pantomime were based on myth (Lucian, Salt. 2, 37–61), whereas Thais is a character of comedy (unless with Braund the reference is to Thais, the mistress of Alexander the Great: according to Lucian Salt. 37 the plots of pantomime involved tales stretching ‘from Chaos down to the story of Cleopatra the Egyptian’).

**O<sub>26</sub> docili** ‘well-trained’ (Mart. Spect. 30.1 *lusit Nereidum docilis chorus* with Coleman), a paradoxical use of the adjective: in a histrionic context, it ought to refer to skill in assuming a rôle, but here that skill is, against all appearances, honed in real life.

**O<sub>27</sub>–34** There are two major difficulties here:

- (1) How to explain the second-person addresses to the *moechocinaedus* in O<sub>27</sub>–9, and the *ueteres amici* at O<sub>29</sub>–31 (*noui consilia ...*)? Courtney 1962: 264–5 suggests a *prosopopoeia* in which the husband reacts to laughter at his expense on the part of the *cinaedus* (*quem rides?*) with

a challenge to prove himself not a man, then turns to his friends, who happen to be standing by, to point out to them the futility of their advice to put a guard on his wife. But this would assume an awareness on the part of the husband that the *cinaedus* is not what he seems, which contradicts the cautionary advice given to him by J. in O 20–6 – unless the husband’s words are meant to illustrate the advice put into action. In any case, the comments about the wife’s behaviour in O 31–4, if spoken by the husband, would show a greater awareness on his part than he has hitherto displayed. It is better therefore with Clauss (as reported by Courtney 1962: 264) to take the speaker as J. himself, acting in the interests of the husband.

- (2) The thought-pattern of the lines is problematic. Since the advice from the friends begins during line 29, it cannot introduce a new section and must be related to the foregoing context, the discovery that the *cinaedus* is in fact an adulterer. What the friends say is ‘bar the door, keep her in’ and after the preceding section, the logical train of thought would be ‘you tell me to keep my wife locked in, but what’s the use when there is a potential lover (the *cinaedus*) already inside the house?’ In that case, the emphasis on the wife’s bribing of her *custodes* is intrusive. Axelson 1939: 50–1 tried to meet this difficulty by assuming that the *custodes* are identical to the *cinaedus*, who is employed in this capacity because – like the eunuch doorkeeper of Ov. *Am.* 2.2–3 – he doesn’t seem to be a sexual threat, i.e. the thought is ‘you tell me to guard the door, but who will guard the guards themselves, since they are *moechocinaedi* with whom she has sex as a reward for not revealing her other adulterous affairs?’ This has the virtue of making the last section fit better into the context, but it also has the considerable disadvantage that the *moechocinaedus* who rules the household is made to undergo a sudden transformation into a mere slave employed as a doorkeeper-*custos*, one of the most lowly of the rôles fulfilled by domestic *serui* (cf. Mc Keown on Ov. *Am.* 1.6, pp. 122–3).

**O 27–8** The sequence of brief, choppy phrases gives an impression of anger struggling to contain itself.

**O 27** *aliis hunc mimum!* elliptical; an imperative like *serua* must be supplied, ‘[reserve] for others this “farce”’; cf. Pers 3.30 *ad populum phaleras!* **sponsio**: a legal term referring to a court action in which a contender laid a claim to ownership or made a statement of fact, putting down a wager of money which he forfeited, or ceded to an opponent, if his claim was shown to be false (Crook 1976).

**O28 purum...uirum** 'every inch a man' (Braund); cf. *OLD purus* 2c. **contendo**: a technical legal term for an affirmation (*Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae* s.v. *contendo* IIIA 977.38–45); cf. Cic. *Fam.* 7.32.2 *ut sacramento contendas mea non esse*. The repetition of *contendo* is troubling (Griffith 1963: 111). To explain it as emphatic repetition on the husband's part seems weak (but note Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.14–15 *accipe, si uis, | accipe iam tabulas*, spoken by a person issuing a challenge, as here). On the other hand, if we award the second *contendo* to the *cinaedus*, whose affirmation must take the form *contendo* [*me purum uirum non esse*] this sits very ill with the husband's response, *fateris?* **fateris?** 'do you admit it?' sc. that you are a *purus uir*.

**O29 an uocat ancillas tortoris pergula?** Evidence in court cases was routinely extracted from slaves by means of torture. Slaves could normally not be examined if their evidence would incriminate their owner, here the *matrona*, but under the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* this did not apply in cases of adultery (Brunt 1980: 256–9, Gardner 1986: 128 and n. 39). **uocat**: indicative with deliberative force; cf. Woodcock 130. **ancillas**: the wife's female slaves are chosen as witnesses because, as personal attendants of their mistress, they would be acquainted with the intimate details of her life, including perhaps seeing the *moechocinaedus* in action. For domestics as privy to a house's secrets cf. Antipater, *On living with a wife* 3.254 von Arnim. **pergula**: a structure built as an extension of a building, used for a multiplicity of purposes (Marquardt 1886: 93–4): here the place where the public *tortor* carries out slave punishments or torture.

**O29 noui...34** Both situation (the pointlessness of taking precautions against infidelity, the uselessness of barring the door to exclude lovers, the bribing of guards (32n.), the unavailing advice of friends) and language (*lasciuae furta puellae*: cf. Pichon 1966 on all three terms, Ov. *Ars* 1.523 *lasciuae...puellae*) are elegiac, assimilating the *matrona* once again to the faithless *puella* of that genre. J. translates into Roman and specific terms the generalised caution of Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 314d *quid prodest etiam diligens custodia, cum uxor seruari impudica non possit? ... difficile custoditur quod plures amant*.

**O29–30 noui | ...amici**: the speaker is well aware, he says, of the sorts of advice – encapsulated in '*pone seram, cohibe*' – that old friends give in such circumstances, but for reasons which he proceeds to explain, this is all to no purpose (O31–4). The *consilia* of friends in matters amatory or sexual are typically ineffectual (Prop. 1.1.25–6, 3.24.9, Hor. *Epod.* 11.25–6).

The stylistic inferiority of this clause to its doublet at 346 has often been noted, the flat *quaecumque*, 'all the kind of things that' causing particular offence. Willis 1989: 463 observes that the caesura after the fourth trochee is found *uix duobus tribusue locis apud Iuuenalem*.

**O<sub>31</sub> cohibe** ‘keep her in’.

**O<sub>32</sub> custodes:** see 235n. The bribing of guards is commonplace, especially in elegy (Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.651–2): here the bribe is a sexual one.

**O<sub>32</sub>–3 qui...furta...| hac mercede silent?** ‘who are rewarded in this way for keeping quiet about her affairs’ (*OLD* s.v. *furtum* 2b). Similarly in Ov. *Ars* 3.655–6 the *custos* is bribed to ‘hold his tongue’ about the *puella*’s infidelity.

**O<sub>33</sub> crimen commune tacetur** ‘their complicity guarantees their silence’ Braund.

**O<sub>34</sub> prudens** ‘prudent, foreseeing’. Ironical: *prudentia* is a virtue – but not when exercised as here.

**366–78** *Some women take delight in sex with eunuchs. The pleasure is greatest if they wait until the slave’s sexual organs are fully mature before submitting him to castration (whereas those emasculated by slave dealers lament their loss of virility and the smallness of such parts as remain). A castrate of the former type attracts attention at the baths for the size of his penis, which challenges even Priapus’. He can sleep with your wife, Postumus, but on no account let him loose on your boy-love.*

We hear much in satirical and moralising texts about eunuchs as lovers of women, the *spado moechus* (Mart. 6.2.6; cf. Grewing on Mart. 6.67, Tertull. *Ad ux.* 2.8 *pleraeque et genere nobiles et re beatae passim ignobilibus et mediocribus ibi coniunguntur ad luxuriam inuentis aut ad licentiam sectis*). Three rationales are advanced for this seeming anomaly, of which the first two are alluded to in 366–8: (1) women are attracted by the effeminate appearance of eunuchs (*mollia semper oscula | delectent et desperatio barbae*), who were castrated in order to preserve artificially their boyish beauty (Quint. *Inst.* 5.12.17, Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.13–15, Philo, *On the special laws* 1.325; also *Anth. Lat.* 97.4 SB and Edwards 1993: 81–4 for the sexual appeal of the epicene male to females); (2) eunuchs were good for illicit sex without the risk of pregnancy: cf. Mart. 6.67 *cur tantum eunuchos habeat tua Caelia quaeris, | Pannyche? uult futui Caelia nec parere*, Theophr. *De nuptiis* ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 3.14b; (3) the perversity of the situation supposedly provoked sexual arousal (Quint. *Inst.* 5.12.19 *libidinem iuuat ipsum effeminati sexus mendacium*, *Anth. Lat.* 97.5 *coniugibus cautis placita est monstrosa uoluptas*). See further Guyot 1980: 63–6. For the belief that eunuchs were capable of intercourse with women see additionally Lucian, *Eun.* 10, Paulus Aegineta, 6.68 Heiberg (περὶ εὐνουχισμοῦ) *ad fin.* and Isid. *Etym.* 10.93. There is some medical basis for this: if males are castrated after puberty, they can retain, at least for a while, sexual desire and capacity to gain erection: cf. Gray 1912: 580, Stevenson 1995: 499.

**366 imbelles** ‘unwarlike’. ‘The eunuch is debarred from a military career because he is a eunuch and *ipso facto* a weakling’ (Booth on Ov. *Am.* 2.3.7).

Eunuchs had a reputation for cowardice (Lucian, *Eun.* 7, Claud. in *Eutrop.* 2.304–22).

**366–7 mollia semper | oscula:** *mollia semper* because the beard of castrates does not grow, but *mollis* is also code for the effeminacy of eunuchs: cf. Mart. 5.41.2 *et concubino mollior Celaenaeo*, Anth. Lat. 97.3 SB, Luc. 10.133.

**367 desperatio barbae:** mock-pathetic. *desperatio* is usually paired with nouns of much greater import, e.g. *rei publicae* (Cic. *Red. sen.* 7) or *uitae* (Cic. *Phil.* 2.88). Facial hair was a symbol of masculinity (Muson. 21, Epictet. *Diss.* 1.16.9–14, Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3.19.1), absent in eunuchs, who, with rare exceptions, either lack it completely or, if they have attained some growth, lose it after castration: cf. Arist. *Gen. an.* 784a7–8, Lucian, *Eun.* 10 ‘smooth of cheek’, Bremer 1958: 110–11.

**368 quod abortiuo non est opus:** cf. 366–78n. At most eunuchs emit a quasi-semen (Gray 1912: 580). **abortiuo:** sc. *medicamento*. Cf. Juv. 2.32.

**368–70 illa uoluptas | ... | ... medicis:** the greatest pleasure is had from such worry-free intercourse when one waits (*expectatos* 371) for the sexual organs to reach full size before performing castration. Underlying 368–70 is the perception that a large member increased female sexual gratification (*uoluptas*): cf. Pompon. 93 Frassinetti *mulier ubi aspexit tam mirifice tutulata truem*, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.1.

**369–70 calida... | ... nigro:** humoral theory held that adolescents were naturally warm and that growth was attributable to a combination of warmth and moisture (cf. Juv. 11.5–6, Eyben 1972: 678–82, 686), moreover that males were intrinsically warmer than females, allowing the males to grow body hair (Macrobian. *Sat.* 7.7.8).

**370 traduntur medicis:** surgical removal of the testicles was entrusted to doctors. Cf. Paulus Aegineta, 6.68 ‘but since we [doctors] are often compelled even against our will by individuals more powerful than us to perform castration’, *Dig.* 48.8.4. **pectine:** the pubic region (Gk. κτεῖς), *nigro* referring to a mature growth of pubic hair. Cf. Plin. *HN* 29.26, Plac. med. 16.2 rec. B *equi spuma si puero inuesti pubem linieris, pili ei non crescunt*, Callim. fr. 343 Pf. ‘nor those who had hair upon their κτεῖς’.

**372–3 testiculos... | ... rapit:** Paulus Aegineta 6.68 describes the operation in flesh-creeping detail: ‘let the person to be castrated be arranged on a bench and let the scrotum, along with the testicles, be squeezed with the fingers of the left hand and let the scrotum be stretched out at ninety degrees and cut by a scalpel with two incisions, one for each testicle. And when the testicles leap out [of the scrotal sac], let them be cut out, being peeled away, leaving only the very thin connection at the joining point

of the vessels [sc. testicles].’ On this and other procedures for creating eunuchs see Maass 1925.

**372** expands hyperbolically on the thought of 368–70. Genital endowment on an impressive scale is often characterised in terms of weight, usually with reference to the penis, less commonly, as here, the testicles: cf. Adams, *LSV* 71. **testiculos:** equivalent in meaning to *testes* (cf. 339n.), but the diminutive form in combination with *bilibres* creates a verbal conceit of the type favoured by Apuleius, e.g. *Met.* 1.4 *offulam grandiorem*.

**373 tonsoris tantum damno:** only the barber feels the loss, because he has one less customer (cf. 367). The phrase is highly ironic, since to be deprived of manhood represents a major *damnum*: cf. Mart. 9.5.4–5 *non puer auari sectus arte mangonis | uirilitatis damna maeret ereptae*, Claud. in *Eutrop.* 1.47–9. **Heliodorus:** a doctor (cf. 370n.), possibly identical with the practitioner of that name who wrote a compendium of surgery; see *RE* VIII 41–2 s.v.

**373A–B.** These verses, found only in O, fit well here, bookended as they are by lines dealing with the experience of the eunuch-slave singled out by his mistress for special treatment, which form an effective contrast with the miserable fate of the *mangonum pueri*, ‘slave-dealers’ boys’: these were castrated earlier than the prodigiously endowed *spado* (Mart. 9.7.7, Quint. *Inst.* 5.12.17). The result was that their organs were proportionately less developed and the opportunity for the compensatory sexual kicks enjoyed by the former thereby nullified.

**373A mangonum:** for *mangones* presiding over the castration of slaves, cf. Mart. 9.5.4–5 (quoted 373n.), Suet. *Dom.* 7.1, *Dig.* 48.3.4. **uera:** whereas the *a domina factus spado* supposedly retained his virility (376–8). **urit** ‘causes to burn with resentment, piques’ (*OLD* 7 s.v.).

**373B debilitas:** a generic term for damage inflicted on the body (*TLL* v 110.71–6), the noun here refers to castration, with attendant loss of sexual powers: cf. Quint. *Inst.* 5.12.19, Sen. *Controv.* 10.4.17. **follisque:** lit. ‘bag’, with reference to the scrotum (Adams, *LSV* 75), in this case emptied of the testicles (372–3n.). **pudet:** having had their testes removed early, and hence lacking testosterone to promote growth of the sexual organs during puberty, the *mangonum pueri* are ashamed of the childish small dimensions of such parts as remain. **cicerisque:** a calque on ἐρέβινθος, ‘chickpea’, in its transferred sense of ‘penis’ (Ar. *Ach.* 801 with Olson). The image derives from the cleft in the head of the *glans*, which resembles that in a chickpea, the diminutive size of which is also relevant here. **relictis:** with both *follisque* and *ciceris*.

**374 conspicuus longe** ‘standing out at a distance’, with a possible sexual pun: cf. *Priap.* 80.1 *at non longa bene est, at non stat bene mentula crassa?*,

Juv. 9.34, Suet. *Vesp.* 23.1. For the expression cf. *Pan. Lat.* 2.6.2 *tua haec forma... quam longe lateque conspicua*.

**374–5 cunctisque notabilis intrat | balnea:** the sight of an oversize penis in the baths, where patrons were naked, provoked favourable attention (Petron. 92.8–9, Mart. 9.33), particularly on the part of the pathically-inclined (Mart. 1.96.11–13, Sen. *Q Nat.* 1.16.2–3), who relished such hypertrophied organs (Mart. 2.51.4, Juv. 9.33–7, SHA *Comm.* 10.9).

**375–6 nec dubie... | prouocat:** he is easily a match for the monstrously endowed (Grant 1975: 53) god Priapus, who protected orchards and gardens. For such Priapic proportions, cf. *Anth. Pal.* 11.224, Mart. 11.51, 11.72 *drauci Natta sui uorat pipinnam, | collatus cui gallus est Priapus*.

**376 a domina factus spado:** *domina* is a surprise. It is usually males in authority who castrate slaves to serve their lust: cf. Sen. *Controv.* 10.4.17, Paulus Aegineta quoted 370, Mayor on Juv. 10.307. *spado* is used in its correct sense of one whose testicles have been ‘dragged’ (σπάω) from the scrotum (372–3n.), but the noun also serves as a generic term for castrate: cf. *Dig.* 50.16.128, Maass 1925: 440–1.

**376–8 dormiat... | ... | ... noli:** J. outrageously suggests that the *spado* be allowed to sleep with Postumus’ mistress, who can apparently accommodate his giant member, but should not be entrusted (*committere*) with Postumus’ favourite boy-slave Bromius, who, notwithstanding the fact that he is physically mature (*iam durum... iamque | tondendum*), will be damaged if penetrated anally by the *spado*, so large is the latter’s organ. J.’s directive implies that Postumus sets less store by his wife than Bromius.

**377 tu:** injects a note of ironic formality into J.’s advice. **iam durum:** he has grown to manhood and lost the physical *mollitia* of a *puer delicatus* (cf. Arn. *Adv. nat.* 5.25 *nondum duri pusionis*). **Postume:** J.’s addressee is named for the first time since line 28.

**377–8 iamque | tondendum:** i.e. having reached the age when his long hair, a distinguishing feature of the *puer delicatus*, should be cut: cf. Mart. 11.78.4 *tondebit pueros iam noua nupta tuos* with Kay, 12.18.24–5 with W–W.

**378 Bromium:** a cult-title of Dionysus, appropriate to a *puer delicatus* because of the epicene appearance, including long hair, common to both. Romans tended to call their slaves by the names of Greek gods or theophoric names: see Baumgart 1936: 44, who notes (46) the great popularity of nomenclature derived from or associated with Dionysus, including five instances of Bromius.

**379–97** *Some women are sexually obsessed with citharodes. One noblewoman went so far as to offer sacrifice for the success of her favourite in the upcoming agon*



Capitolinus. *She could hardly have done more had her husband been sick or her little son despaired of by the doctors. Evidently the gods have plenty of time on their hands if they can answer such trivial prayers as this.*

J. returns abruptly to the theme of 63–77, that women, especially upper-class women (cf. 385n. and 382n. *sardonyches*), are erotically fixated on stage performers and artistes. Here he singles out one particular class of artiste, the *citharoedus*. There is extensive evidence, not arising solely from polemic, for relationships between high-status Romans and performers (Leppin 1992: 116–19) – mostly actors (cf. 396–7) rather than musicians, though the wife of Pertinax allegedly loved a citharode (76n.). But the allegation that women of this bent work their way sexually through the ranks of the citharodes (379–80) is typical Juvenalian hyperbole. Less typical (cf. however Juv. 7.82–7) is a dense series of sexual *double-entendres* in lines 380–4: see *ad loc.* For innuendo of this type cf. Uría 2007: 48–53, 60–1.

**379 cantu:** includes playing and singing, both being part of the citharoedic art (74n.).

**379–80 nullius fibula durat | ... praetoribus:** no citharode is safe from her sexual advances, as she removes the penile sheath that supposedly protected their voices by preventing coitus (73–4nn.).

**380 uocem uendentis praetoribus:** for *uocem uendere*, ‘hire out one’s voice’ cf. Mart. 7.64.9 with Vioque, Juv. 8.194. Augustus assigned management of all the major *ludi* to the praetors, a sum being awarded to them for this purpose from the treasury (in later times supplemented from their private funds): see Dio Cass. 54.2.3, Hirschfeld 1905: 285–7. The pay dispensed to the players was known as *lucar*.

**380–1 organa semper | in manibus:** *organum*, first of several Greek words in this passage, is a generic term for a musical instrument. Often, as here (*testudine* 381), it is followed by specific identification of the instrument in question (Löschhorn 1971: 198–201). There is a likely *double-entendre* in the words, as though the woman were having vicarious sex by holding the instrument. *organum* is widely used of the limbs of the body, including the genitals (Löschhorn 203–4), although the evidence is admittedly sparse and late; note, however, Arist. *Hist. an.* 500a15–16 ‘the organs (τὰ ὄργανα) used for mounting the female’ and a possible etymological play on ὀργᾶν, ‘swell with lust’. J. may also have had in mind Martial’s scabrous *solebat | illic* [sc. *in mentula*] *Penelope semper habere manum* (11.104.15–16).

**381–2 densi... | sardonyches** ‘her sardonix-rings glitter thick and fast all over the lyre’. Originally, says Pliny, rings were worn on one finger only, however *hic* [the middle finger] *nunc solus excipitur, ceteri omnes onerantur*,

*atque etiam priuatim articuli minoribus aliis* (HN 33.24): cf. Sen. *Q Nat.* 7.31.2, *RE* II 1.826 s.v. *Ringe*. Wearing rings was standard practice for females (Sen. *ibid.*, Clem. Alex. *Paed.* 3.11.59.1), but J.'s lady has a specific reason for sporting multiple rings while fingering the instrument – imitation of musicians who embellished their performances by displays of jewellery (Plin. *HN* 37.6–7).

**381 testudine:** a common metonymy for the lyre, supposedly invented when Hermes used the shell of a tortoise (*testudo marginata*, native to Greece but rare elsewhere) to form the resonator of the instrument (*Hom. Hymn Herm.* 24–56, Landels 1999: 61–2, Mathiesen 1999: 238–9). *testudo*, 'lyre' is used loosely for *cithara* (cf. 391), which was largely the instrument of professional players (cf. 383), the lyre being more for amateurs (Michaelides 1978: 168, 193). In a context replete with puns, *testudo* may also hint at *testis*, 'testicle'.

**382 sardonyches:** sardonix, a form of agate, chiefly used for rings, has a striking appearance, with three layers of different colours blending into each other, vividly captured by Ach. Tat. 2.11.3 and clearly visible in surviving examples of sardonix rings, e.g. Marshall 1968: nos. 495, 505, 507, 804, 819. Sardonix rings were expensive (Mart. 10.87.14, Juv. 7.143–4), enjoying prestige at Rome (Plin. *HN* 37.85), which speaks to the status of the woman whose fingers abound with them. See further Plin. *HN* 37.86–9, King 1870: 287–99. **crispo numerantur... chordae** 'the strings are struck in succession [by her] with the quill, making them vibrate'. Friedländer explains 'in that the plectrum runs across all of the strings, they are so to speak counted by it.' There are sustained sexual puns in 382, as if the woman were having surrogate sex by strumming the strings. *pecten* can signify the genital region (37on.) and is employed by Auson. *Cent. nupt.* 127 to signify 'penis' in a misappropriation of Virg. *Aen.* 6.647 *iam pectine pulsat eburno*. In Ausonius the verbal play depends on 'striking', *pulsare*, as a metaphor for sexual penetration (Adams, *LSV* 145–9) and a tendency, operative here also, to use musical terminology, the language of lyre-playing included, as sexual slang (*LSV* 25): cf. Varro, *Men.* 368 Astbury *et id dicunt suam Briseidem producere, quae eius neruia tractare solebat*, Pherecrates, fr. 155.16 K–A with Borthwick 1968: 68–9. Further, *numerare* is cognate with *numerus*, which can refer to sexual intercourse (Ov. *Am.* 3.7.18, 26). *crispus* too may contain an erotic innuendo: the adjective is used of the shimmying motion of erotic dancing (*Copa* 2 *crispum sub crotalo docta mouere latus*). **crispo:** used actively = *qui crispet*, 'which makes [the strings] vibrate'. For *crispus* of such a motion cf. Pacuv. 229 Ribb., Auson. *Mos.* 194–5, 253–4. **pectine** = the *plectrum* of 384, the implement with which the strings were plucked. Made of hard wood, ivory, horn or metal, it was attached to the instrument by a cord and held in the right hand.

This much seems clear, but it is difficult to determine precisely the techniques of holding and playing the lyre and similar instruments, in particular the rôle of the left hand (Michaelides 1978: 191-2, 260, Mathiesen 1999: 247-8, Landels 1999: 55-7).

**383 tener** emphasises Hedymeles' youthful charms in the eyes of his besotted fan: cf. *OLD* s.v. 1-2. **Hedymeles** 'Mister sweetsong' Landels 1999: 200 (Gk. *melos* 'song'; *hedus*, 'sweet', of song, Hom. *Od.* 8.64). For a similar speaking name cf. *CIL* vi 10124b *Amphion C. Salari Capitonis citharod.* *Hedymeles* is a satyr's name in *CIG* 8383: satyrs play the *barbitos* in vase-paintings (Mathiesen 1999: 252). **operas dedit** 'gave a performance'. *opera* is coupled with various verbs in this sense, though we have found no other examples referring to a musical performance. Its use here allows another *double-entendre*, on *operam* (-as) *dare* in its obscene sense (cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 45 *ubi ei dederit operas*, of a prostitute servicing a client, Adams, *LSV* 156-7), the implication being that the woman paid Hedymeles for sex.

**383-4 hunc tenet, hoc se | solatur:** as a surrogate for Hedymeles in person. For *tenet* cf. 70. *solari* and cognates are often used of soothing the pangs of love. There may be a mischievous allusion to Virg. *G.* 4.464 *ipse caua solans aegrum testudine amorem*.

**384 gratoque indulget basia plectro:** another line laden with innuendo. *basium* is a highly erotic sort of kiss (Moreau 1978), *indulgere*, 'grant as a favour, bestow' (*OLD* s.v. 5) can take on a sexual colour (cf. *Juv.* 2.164-5), while *plectro* (from Gk. *plectron*, an instrument for striking the strings) conjures up thoughts of the penis and 'striking' as a sexual metaphor (382n.). Finally, *gratus* is common in erotic contexts (McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 2.19.30), usually however in relation to persons, so its application to *plectro* creates an effect of paradox. J. envisages the woman as committing *fellatio* by proxy.

**385 quaedam ... Appi:** i.e. a woman descended from noble stock on both sides (for the idea cf. *Prop.* 4.11.29-32). The Aelii Lamiae, who rose to prominence in the first century BC, enjoyed considerable eminence in the first and second centuries AD (*Tac. Ann.* 6.27.2 *genus ... decorum*, Treggiari 1973: 245-53, N-R 212). On the other side she belongs to the Appii Claudii, a distinguished aristocratic line with a strong sense of family dignity (*Cic. Cael.* 34, 68, Tatum 1999: 32-4). The name Appius is properly a *praenomen*, but was so prevalent among this branch of the *gens Claudia* that it came to be used of them as if it were a family name (*RE* II 242 s.v. *Appius*). **nominis Appi:** *nominis* is genitive of description and *Appi* an adjective (cf. *uia Appia*), lit. 'of the Appian name'. For the phraseology cf. *Tac. Ann.* 1.8.1 *Livia in ... nomen ... Augustum adsumebatur*.

**386** She consults the gods to see if Pollio will be successful in the Capitoline contest (387–8), offering a victim whose entrails she will inspect for signs (392). In Roman sacrifices, just prior to the killing of the animal, the main sacrificiant consecrated it (*immolare*) by pouring upon its head wine and *mola salsa*, a mixture of ground meal (*far*) and salt. Cf. *CIL* VI 2065.1.19–20 *immolauitq(ue) | uino, mola cultroque*, Beard *et al.* 1998: 148–9 and 149c for a visual representation. **Ianum Vestamque**: irrespective of which god or gods were being addressed, Roman ritual required that Janus occupy the first place, Vesta (usually) the last. Hence to call on Janus and Vesta becomes in effect ‘to pray’: cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.67, Holland 1961: 283–5, Wissowa, *RK* 103. Various reasons are offered for the primacy of Janus. Serv. *Aen.* 1. 292 explains the presence of Vesta in all prayers, but not her particular location.

**387–8 an...quercum | ...fidibus promittere**: at the quinquennial *agon Capitolinus* or *Capitolia*, instituted by Domitian in AD 86 and involving musical, equestrian and gymnastic contests (Suet. *Dom.* 4.4), victors received a garland of oak leaves (*quercum*) from the emperor’s hand (Mart. 4.1.6, Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.231), the oak being sacred to Jupiter, to whom the *agon Capitolinus* was dedicated (Tert. *De spect.* 11.1). The *Capitolia* rapidly became very prestigious, one reason why Pollio’s admirer is eager to know if he will take first prize. See further Caldelli 1993: 105–8, Rieger 1999, Rumscheid 2000: 82–4.

**387 Pollio**: a famous citharode (Mart. 4.61.9–12, *cithara* 391, Juv. 7.176).

**388–90 quid faceret plus | aegrotante uiro ... | filiolum?** ‘what more could she have done if her husband were sick or the doctors despaired of the life of her poor little son?’ A good wife would look after her husband when ill (Dio Cass. 56.3.3, Watson 2008a: 292); such solicitousness extended to prayers and offerings for the recovery of the loved one (cf. Tib. 1.5.9–16, Ov. *Am.* 2.13.23–4 with McKeown). *filiolum* is a pathetic diminutive (‘the diseases of children ... are unbearable to look upon’ Eur. *Alc.* 885–7), suggesting the lamentable vulnerability to early death of young Roman children (Parkin 1992: 92–5, Rawson 2003: 95–104). All such grave, if putative, concerns are, however, trumped by her obsession with Pollio.

**389 erga**: found here uniquely in later poetry, *erga* is used primarily of feelings towards persons and things (H–S 229). Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.74.3 *anxii erga Seianum*.

**390 aram**: located before the temple (Wissowa, *RK* 417), where she prays for Pollio’s victory.

**390-2 nec turpe putauit | ... | ...ut mos est:** it was Roman practice to cover the head when praying and sacrificing (Plaut. *Amph.* 1093-4 *inuocat deos immortales, ut sibi auxilium ferant* | ... *capite operto*, Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 266d, Appel 1909: 190-1, Oster 1988: 493-5), a devotional gesture which applied alike to women (Varro, *Ling.* 5.130 *Romano ritu sacrificium feminae cum faciunt, capita uelant*, Titin. 86-7 Ribb.) and men. The *dictata verba* are 'the liturgy, the prescribed form of prayer, which was first gone through by the officiating priest and then repeated, word for word, by the person consulting the god' Duff (for *perferre*, to go through a formula, see *OLD* s.v. 5b). All the ritual forms are followed (*ut mos est*), but the subject of the prayer, a *cithara*, or rather *citharoedus*, is shameful (*turpe*) and trivial – rather like the frivolous, highly personal prayers addressed to the Capitoline Triad of which Seneca complains (ap. August. *De civ. D.* 6.10).

**392 aperta palluit agna:** she paled in fearful anticipation of the outcome when the *haruspex* (cf. 397) inspected the entrails of the sacrificial lamb, to divine from their appearance the intentions of the gods. The Romans broadly speaking distinguished between victims sacrificed as an offering to the deities, and a *hostia consultatoria*, as here (Macrob. *Sat.* 3.5.1 and 5). The animal of choice for the latter was the sheep. See Thulin 1906: 11-18, Van Der Meer 1987: 3-9. For consultation of the *haruspices* in matters of personal import cf. Pliny's criticism of Regulus, *Ep.* 6.2.2. **aperta:** after the victim was killed, it was cut open and its *exta*, still attached to the body, were scrutinised for gross abnormalities which, if found, necessitated repeating the sacrifice, and it was strictly speaking only after this that divinatory inspection of the entrails by the *haruspices* took place (Wissowa, *RK* 417-20). But *aperta* telescopes the two stages, as does Virgil's *pecudumque reclusis* | *pectoribus inhians spirantia consulit* [*Dido*] *exta* (*Aen.* 4.63-4).

**393 dic ... quaeso, dic:** the intensity of this phrase reflects J.'s indignation that the venerable Janus should be subjected to such a trivial prayer. **antiquissime diuom:** for Janus so described cf. Herodian, 1.16.1 'the most ancient of the indigenous Italian gods'. He was the god who was there since the start of time, *diuom deus* or *principium deorum* (Wissowa, *RK* 103-12).

**394-5 respondes his ...? magna otia caeli; | ... non est quod agatur apud uos:** appropriating the language of the Epicureans and over-simplifying their views, J. sarcastically suggests that these must be right to suppose that the gods have nothing to occupy them, if they attend to such as she (*his*). Epicurus stated in Κύρια Δόξα 1 that god 'has no troubles himself (οὐτε αὐτὸ πράγματα ἔχει) nor does he cause them to others'. πράγματα translates into Latin as *negotium* (cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.45 *id nec habere ipsum negotii quicquam nec exhibere alteri*), but 'having no *negotium*' could also be construed as 'having

no *business*, having nothing to do’, a version reflected here, also Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.123 *deum... omnino nihil curantem, nihil agentem*, Sen. *Ben.* 4.4., Tert. *Apol.* 47.6 *Epicurei [deum adseuerant] otiosum et inexercitum*, Hippol. *Philosoph.* 22.3 (Diels *Doxographi Graeci* 572) ‘god is at ease’. Cf. Rist 1972: 146–56, Baltes 2000: esp. 93–9.

**394 pater:** a typical term of respect for gods. Cf. *CIL* XI 5374 *aram Ianipatri*, Wissowa, *RK* 109 n. 8.

**395 quod uideo** ‘so far as I can see’. *quod* in usages like this normally takes a subjunctive (cf. *quod sciam, quod meminerim*, Krebs and Schmalz 1905–7: II 466). Courtney accordingly flirts with φ’s *ut video*.

**396 haec... illa** broadens the scope of the attack from the target of 385–94. For women’s obsession with actors cf. 67–75.

**397 solet:** Scholte’s emendation for MSS *uolet*; there seems no rationale for the future tense and a present is needed to balance *consulit*. Also, if the *matrona* ‘is in the habit of’ interceding for a tragic actor, this would contribute to the *haruspex* developing varicose veins (see next n.). **uari-cosus fiet haruspex** ends the section on a note of comic bathos: such are the demands upon the *haruspex* made by stage-struck women that *multum stando uaricosus efficitur* Schol. Varicose veins in the legs (Plin. *HN* 11.252, Oribas. *Coll. Med.* 45.18.32, Grmek and Gourévitch 1998: fig. 231) were a subject for humour (Macrob. *Sat.* 2.3.5) and *uaricosus* is an undignified word (Lucil. 801 Marx, Pompon. fr. 85 Frassinetti). Medical opinion put the complaint down to weakness in the veins combined with bad humours (Harris 1973: 451–5), but there seems to have been a popular view (substantiated by modern research) that persons who spent a lot of time on their feet (such as orators and soldiers: Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.143, Pers. 5.189, Plut. *Marius* 6.3) were likely to develop varicose veins; cf. also Varro ap. Nonius 38 L *si tuam redam non habuissem, haberem uarices*.

**398–412** *Better, however, a wife with an enthusiasm for singing than an unsexed creature who flits about the city, mixing unabashedly with males and addressing generals in full regalia. She knows all the news, intimate and international, is first to catch the latest rumours, or simply invents them – not least reports of disaster – and relays them to all and sundry.*

J. here conflates two for the most part discrete figures, first (398–401) the woman who goes through the city talking to males unrelated to her, in defiance of female proprieties, second (*haec eadem* 402), the inveterate gossip, a character-type which is not sex-specific. Plutarch, *Praec. coniug.* 142c advised ‘the words of a respectable woman should never be public property: she should be as shy with her speech as with exposing her body, and should guard it against strangers’; Cato, in the debate over the *lex Oppia*,

fulminated *qui hic mos est* [*mulierum*] *in publicum procurrendi . . . et uiros alienos appellandi?* (Liv. 34.2.9): protocols that J.'s *matrona* sensationally violates. A character in Menander states 'a wife should always speak second, and the husband have primacy in everything' (fr. 374.1–2 K–A: cf. Plut. *ibid.* 142d), whereas here the *matrona* boldly speaks up, not deferring to her husband, who is present (400–1).

The second type drawn upon in this section is the rumour-monger (λογοποιός, *famigerator*), best exemplified in Theophr. *Char.* 8 (λογοποιία), Plaut. *Trin.* 199–222 and Mart. 9.35. A key trait of such individuals is that their 'news' is fabricated (Theophr. 8.1 'λογοποιία is the invention of untrue reports and events', Mart. 9.35.2 *plurima dum fingis, sed quasi uera refers*): cf. 408–9 *rumores . . . quosdam facit* and the report of the inundation at 409–11, which has no basis in the historical record. Another characteristic is the relish which these take in reporting bad news (Theophr. 8.7–8 with Diggle, Lys. 22.14 'and they are so delighted to see your disasters that they learn of them before anyone else, others they themselves fabricate (λογοποιοῦσιν)', Isoc. 5.75), a trait replicated in the ghoulish reporting of 409–11. The rumour-monger's self-image demands that he be first with the news (Theophr. 8.3, Lys. 22.14, Lewis 1996: 92): cf. 407–9 *instantem regi Armenio Parthoque cometen* | *prima uidet, famam rumoresque illa recentes* | *excipit ad portas*. Lastly, the Plautine gossip claims to know the private conversation of couples (*Trin.* 207–8), possibly the inspiration for the prurient interest that J.'s *matrona* takes in others' sex-lives (403–6).

A further model for J.'s rumour-monger is Virgil's, also Ovid's, personified *Fama* (*Aen.* 4.173–97, *Met.* 12.39–63). *Fama* is winged (Virg. 180–1, 184 *nocte uolat*), and that J. has Virgil in mind is suggested by the initial *peruolare*, lit. 'fly through': in fact the whole phrase *totam peruolet urbem* (398) adapts the language applied to *Fama* elsewhere in the *Aeneid* (7.104, 8.554 *Fama uolat paruam subito uulgata per urbem*, 12.608 *hinc totam infelix uulgatur fama per urbem*). Crucially, the *matrona* relays a mixture of truth and falsehood (408–9), which is a defining feature of the Virgilian and Ovidian *Fama* (*Aen.* 4.188–90, *Met.* 12.54–5, also *Met.* 9.138–9).

A cluster of references in 407–11 to events spanning approximately AD 113–17 (see *ad loc.*) suggests AD 117 as a *terminus post quem* for the composition of *Satire* 6: it was probably written at the very end of Trajan's reign or the very beginning of Hadrian's, when the events in question would still be fresh in readers' minds. Hardie 1997–8 contends that *Satires* 1–6 were all written under Hadrian, primarily on the grounds that the spoof of Domitian's council in *Satire* 4 could just as easily imply an unflattering contrast with a Hadrianic *consilium* as a Trajanic one. We find this unconvincing, above all because it was standard practice to compare a previous regime unfavourably with an immediately following one, rather than one belonging to the more distant future. See also 105–6n.

**398 totam peruolet urbem:** cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.104, 8.554 cited 398–412n., also Theophrastus' rumour-monger (*Char.* 8.9) who 'has run up to everyone in the city with his news'.

**399 audax et...possit quae** 'bare-faced and the sort of woman who can bring herself to' (generic subjunctive). **audax:** her effrontery consists in thrusting herself forward importunately in public, in a manner unbecoming to a woman (Sall. *Cat.* 25.1 *uirilis audaciae* (of Sempronia), Muson. 3 quoted intro. 46). Cf. Bellandi 2003: 169 n. 398, Kaster 2005: 55. **coetus...uirorum:** like Livy's wicked Tullia, who *nec reuerita* [*est*] *coetum uirorum* (1.48.5).

**400–1 cumque...| ipsa loqui:** far from allowing her husband to speak for her, as a proper *matrona* should (398–412n.), she buttonholes military leaders, and at the most inapposite moment: these would only be garbed in the *paludamentum*, the scarlet, purple and gold cloak of the general, when about to leave the city for a campaign: cf. Mommsen 1887–8: 163–4, 431–3, Rüpke 1990: 135, 140. She is doubtless seeking inside knowledge of foreign or military affairs (cf. 402–3, 407–11; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.50–6): matters in which, according to conservatives, women should not meddle (Sen. *Helv.* 19.6–7, Liban. *Or.* 26.16–17).

**401 recta facie:** *rectus* is usually taken to signify a 'straight' countenance, one betraying no sign of emotion: but it better suits the characterisation of the *matrona* as *virago* if the adjective is understood as 'directed straight ahead' (*OLD* s.v. 5), i.e. her gaze is not downcast in the manner of a modest woman exposed to the eyes of unfamiliar males (cf. Sen. *Tro.* 1137–8 *ipsa deiectos gerit* | *uultus pudore*, Ov. *Am.* 3.6.67, Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.21). **siccisque mamillis:** like an unsexed creature, i.e. unwomanly, in contrast to the cavewoman of 9. Cf. Lady Macbeth 'come, you spirits...unsex me here...come to my woman's breasts and take my milk for gall' (Shakespeare, *Macbeth* Act 1 Sc. 5). Bellandi 2003: 169–77 revives the mediaeval explanation that her breasts are free from the sweat produced by strong feelings (e.g. Pers. 2.53–4) i.e. she feels no anxiety in speaking to the *paludati duces*. But his interpretation founders on the gendered specificity of *siccae mamillae* (his parallels are all of the *pectus* sweating with emotion). See further Nardo 1977: 535–7.

**402 haec...nouit...orbe:** J. probably had in mind Semonides' bitch-woman who 'desires to hear everything, to know everything, peering and prowling everywhere' (fr. 7.13–14 W).

**403 quid Seres...agant:** Martial's gossip (9.35) similarly claims to know what is happening among far-flung peoples. 'Chinese' and 'Thracians' stand for the far East and the far North and represent areas of current



interest: Trajan's wars in Dacia (northernmost region of the Roman world and north of Thrace) concluded in AD 107, while his Parthian/Eastern campaign occupied 113–17 (it is noteworthy that the trade route in silk, *serica*, from China passed through Parthia, Lieberman 1953: 10, 22, 38).

**403–4 secreta nouercae | et pueri:** the immediately following topics (*quis amet... adulter*) establish that the allusion here is to a sexual scandal, i.e. an incestuous relationship between stepmother and stepson, *puer* highlighting the discrepancy in age characteristic of such affairs: cf. Watson 1995: 136–9, 214–16.

**404 quis amet:** cf. Martial's *bellus homo* (3.63), *qui scit quam quis amet* (11). **quis...adulter:** *quis* is used adjectively: see *OLD* s.v. *quis*<sup>1</sup> 5a. **diripiatur** 'is fought over, is contended for', a usage of imperial Latin: cf. Vioque on Mart. 7.76.1.

**405 dicet...fecerit:** extramarital sex with a widow involved the offence of *stuprum*: cf. Papin. *Dig.* 48.5.6.1, Fantham 1991.

**406 quibus uerbis...modis quot** make it clear that the gossip's interest is distinctly prurient. *uerba* refers to arousing language used during intercourse (190–1, 197nn.), *modis* to sexual positions: cf. Tib. 2.6.51–2 *tunc mens mihi perdita fingit | quisue meam teneat, quot teneatue modis*, Ov. *Am.* 2.8.27–8.

**407–8 instantem...cometen | prima uidet:** this comet, for which J. is the sole Graeco-Roman source, is traditionally said to have been visible at Rome in November AD 115 (slightly later Schöve 1984: 287), but has been tentatively assigned to January 117 by Ramsey 2007: 181. In fact the Armenian campaign was finished by 114 and the Parthian campaign commenced in 116 (407n.): the later dating hence makes even more problematical than before the statement that the comet was 'threatening' (*instantem*) the kings of Armenia and Parthia. But J. may be sacrificing chronological accuracy for dramatic effect when he connects the fall of these kingdoms with the cometary event, and in any case the two kings, of Parthia and Armenia, were so closely linked that they could readily be lumped together (cf. Dio Cass. 68.17).

**407 instantem:** the idea that comets portended wars, disasters and other major occurrences, not least the death of kings and great men of state (e.g. Suet. *Ner.* 36, *Vesp.* 23), was deep-rooted: cf. Manil. 1.874–926, Cramer 1954: 117–18, Ramsey 2007: 188–9, 193. **regi Armenio Parthoque:** the Armenian king Parthamasiris, who had usurped the throne from Axidares, his younger brother, was deposed by the Romans when Trajan, who had invaded Armenia, refused his request for the crown and annexed Armenia as a Roman province. Parthamasiris died mysteriously soon afterwards.

These events took place in the second half of AD 114. In 116 Trajan set out for Parthia. He captured the main city of Ctesiphon, ousted the king Chosroes (or Osroes) and installed a king of his own choice, Parthamaspatēs, who was, however, rejected by the Parthians, and there continued to be revolts. Trajan died in 117, before the situation was resolved. Cf. Griffin, *CAH* XI 124–6, Butcher 2003: 45–6. **cometen**: Gk. accusative singular. ‘Comet’ derives its name from the κόμη, ‘tail’, lit. ‘hair’ visible at its end, as with the spectacular Hale-Bopp comet, seen at its brightest in the Northern hemisphere in 1997.

**409 ad portas**: sc. *urbis*.

**409–11 isse Niphaten** | ... | **diluuiō**: the Niphates is properly an Armenian mountain range rather than a river of the country, but is often erroneously so regarded by Latin poets (N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.9.20). In contrast to *nutare* ... *terras*, the flooding of the river seems to be a fiction (cf. *rumores* ... *quosdam facit*). The detail may have been inspired by a scene in Trajan’s column (dedicated in AD 113 and memorialising his Dacian wars), where Dacians are shown attempting to cross a river but are swept away by its torrential flow (Jones 2000).

**411 nutare urbes, subsidere terras** probably refers to the great earthquake at Antioch in December 115, graphically described by Dio Cass. 68.24–5, in which ‘many cities suffered damage’ (Dio 68.24.1), ‘buildings ... were tossed this way and that’ (Dio *ibid.* 3: cf. *nutare*) ‘and hills ... settled’, ὑφίζησε (Dio 68.25.5: cf. *subsidere*).

**412** Cf. Theophr. *Char.* 8.13 ‘in what *stoa*, in what workshop, in what part of the market-place do they not pass the day exhausting their listeners?’, a passage, however, of dubious authenticity. For gossip on street corners cf. also Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.50.

**413–33** *Worse is the wife who flies into a tantrum if her sleep is disturbed by a neighbour’s dog: owner and animal are thrashed on her orders. She is a fearful sight as she makes her way to the baths at night, attended by a large retinue, where she works up a great thirst, while her dinner guests are kept waiting. Arriving at last, she tosses down a large volume of wine, which she then vomits up, while her husband tries not to be sick at the disgusting spectacle.*

This passage combines, at unequal length, two distinct character-types, the irascible wife who flies into a vicious rage when provoked, and the mannish female. The two sections are linked by the bridging clause *gravis occursu, taeterrima uultu* | *balnea nocte subit* 418–19. That women were naturally prone to anger was a widespread belief (268–85n.) and the same goes for cruelty (Men. *Sent.* 374 Jaekel, Plut. *Cons. ad ux.* 609c). These two traits are here thrown into relief by the woman’s punishing her neighbours as

if they had committed a crime (see on *rapere*, *humiles* and *fustes*, which all have a legal colour), whereas their only offence is a barking dog.

As for the second character-type, the primary model is Martial's lesbian Philaenis (7.67). Like Philaenis, J.'s *matrona* exercises with heavy weights (J. 421, M. 5–6), receives a sexually stimulating massage (J. 422–3, M. 8) and drinks copiously of wine prior to eating (J. 425–8, M. 9–10), before vomiting it up (J. 429–33, M. 9–10), a concluding vignette developed with a wealth of revolting detail absent from Martial. Also of note is Sen. *Ep.* 95.20–1, complaining that women have usurped masculine vices, several of which are replicated by J.'s *matrona*: *non minus peruigilant, non minus potant, et oleo et mero uiros prouocant; aequae inuitis ingesta uisceribus per os reddunt et uinum omne uomitu remetiuntur* (21).

**413 nec tamen...magis intolerabile quam:** bad though the preceding fault (*uitium*) is, what follows is worse. A bridging expression of the same type as 434. **quae** (P), short for *eius quae* (cf. Caes. *B Gall.* 6.22.2 *cognitionibusque hominum, quique (= ac eorum qui) una coierunt*, K–S 2.282), is preferable to φ's *quod*, 'an obvious simplification' Courtney: J. is dealing in character-types who *embody* stereotypical female vices.

**414–18 uicinos humiles** (414) and *dominum* (417) refer to the same group of people, *nam si...canem* 415–18 offering a specific instance of her regular (*solet*) cruelty and irascibility towards her humble neighbours. They are possibly her tenant-shopkeepers: in Rome elite houses and petty commercial activities stood cheek by jowl. If they were her tenants, they would simply have to put up with her brutality for fear of summary eviction, a landlord's right (likewise, if the shops were run by her slaves or freedmen, an alternative possibility, these would hardly be in a position to complain). Cf. Frier 1980: 51–2, 64–5, 70, Wallace-Hadrill 1994: 122–31.

**414 humiles:** the choice of adjective may reflect a legal distinction, regulating punishments according to status, between *honestiores* (senators, *equites* and others) and *humiliores* (the *plebs*, also slaves), found from Hadrian's time, but apparently gathering strength well before then (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 9.5.3, Garnsey 1970: 171, Saller, *CAH* xi 852). Under it corporal punishment was reserved for *humiliores* (Garnsey 104): cf. *concidere loris*. **rapere:** 'haul off for punishment' (*OLD* s.v. 7b). **rapere...concidere:** using the agency of the slaves addressed in *afferte* and *iubet...feriri* (416–17).

**415 exsecrata** 'cursing them' (Martyn 1978: 213–15). The MSS are split between *exortata* (meaningless) and *exorata*, which would impose on 415–18 the sense 'if she is appeased', she is content with using the whip (*loris*) on the neighbours, whereas, if wakened during the night, she has recourse to a more severe punishment in the shape of *fustes*, cudgels

(415–18) – nonsensical, since *fustes* are a much milder type of punishment than *lora* (cf. *Dig.* 4.8.19.10 and Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 4.11). *experrecta* (Duff) is also unlikely, as it preempts the cause given for her anger in *nam si...rumpuntur somni* 415–16. **nam si:** introduces a particular instance of the general cruelty and irascibility noted in *uicinos...somni* (unless *exorata* is read, in which case *nam* has a contrastive force). For a similar use cf. 487. **latratibus:** of watchdogs, which barked upon the approach of any stranger to the property they were guarding: cf. Columella, *Rust.* 7.12.7, Toynbee 1973: 107–8.

**415–16 alti | ...somni:** the wealthy of Rome could normally enjoy sound sleep by virtue of their living arrangements, unlike the majority of the population: cf. Juv. 3.234–5, Mart. 12.57. The neighbour's barking dog puts paid to this.

**416 fustes:** the military staff, *fustis*, was the instrument for civilian beatings. For the *humiliores* (414n.), beating was often the punishment for small crimes (Garnsey 1970: 136–9). Here no crime has been committed, but the woman proceeds anyway, like Caligula in similar circumstances (Suet. *Calig.* 26.4).

**417 dominum:** used ironically of the dog's master, who is being treated like a slave in being subjected to a thrashing.

**418 deinde canem:** the enjambment neatly points up, in a humorously deflationary conclusion, the *matrona*'s unreasoning bad temper: the dog is, after all, just obeying its natural instincts by barking (Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.158 with Pease). Sen. *De ira* 2.26.4 says that it is madness to get angry at dumb animals, since any injury they do is not by design, and urges (ibid. 3.35.3) that one should be able to hear *fremitus animalium latratuque* without loss of temper. **gravis occursu, taeterrima uultu** describes the woman's demeanour as she makes her way along the street to the baths. *gravis occursu* ('formidable to meet' Braund) recontextualises maternal *grauitas* (178n.) to make it into something undesirable. *taeterrima uultu* means that she is hideous to look upon, such is her sourness of expression (*OLD* s.v. *uultus* 1).

**419 balnea nocte subit** sounds several notes of disapproval: (a) night is late for a bath (Suet. *Aug.* 76.2, Mart. 3.36.5, 10.70.13), the optimal hour being the eighth (Fagan 1999: 22); (b) by bathing so late she keeps her guests waiting (424–5); (c) if women bathed before men, i.e. up to the seventh hour (Weber 1996: 133), there may be an imputation of immodesty in *nocte...subit* (but the evidence is conflicted (Nielsen 1993: 135–8) and the issue of mixed bathing too thorny to explore here).

**419–20 conchas et castra...**|...**iubet**: the *matrona* and her retinue of slaves *en route* to the baths (for such processions see Shelton 1981: pls. 6 and 8, Fagan 1999: figs. 27–8) are assimilated ironically to a general and his army on the move, no doubt with comparable upheaval and noise (cf. Lucian, *Nigr.* 13). The military metaphor *castra moueri* anticipates the masculine character of the behaviour which follows (cf. 413–33n.).

**419 conchas**: vessels for purposes of bathing could be got at the baths or, as here, taken with one: cf. Shelton 1981, Nielsen 1993: I 142–4, Nenova-Merdjanova 1999. *conchae* are presumably so called because they have the shape of conches (Nielsen I 142 n. 28). Visual and literary evidence suggests that they are shaped like a Triton's horn, in which case they contain the oil with which the woman will later (422–3) be rubbed down (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.7.22–3 with N–H). Alternatively, they are flat like scallops (the Schol. to Juv. 3.277 glosses *pelues* (basins) as *conchae*).

**420–3 magno...**|...|...|...**coegit**: commentators usually take *sudare* to refer to sweating in the *Laconicum*, a kind of ancient sauna (the sequence in the baths was exercise, massage, sweating: cf. Mart. 7.32.5–10 with Vioque). But the statement that she enjoys sweating whenever (*cum*) her arms have become tired with exercising with weights (421) and she has submitted to massage (422–3) suggests that the sweat is the joint product of her exercise and the sexually-tinged ministrations of the masseur (for sweating as a sign of sexual excitement cf. Sappho, fr. 31.13 L–P, Theoc. *Id.* 2.107).

**420 magno...tumultu** ‘with great fuss and noise’ Duff. Her concern about being disturbed by nocturnal sounds does not extend to corresponding solicitude for others.

**421** There is evidence that females participated in a limited way in athletic pursuits (Lee 1988: 116–17): *halteres* (= *massa*) light enough for female use have been discovered (Crowther 1977: 118) and marital protreptics urged physical exercise on wives (Nicostratus, *On marriage* Stob. 4.594). But by having the *matrona* lift heavy weights (*lassata...gravi massa*), J. deliberately puts the worst construction on the woman's activities, making her resemble a male weight-lifter (cf. Mart. 7.67.5–6 *gravesque draucis* | *halteras facili rotat* [*Philaenis*] *lacerto*): strenuous exercise was something that females should normally avoid (Sor. *Gyn.* 1.64). **ceciderunt** ‘have flagged’. **massa**: *halteres*, cylindrical lumps of metal or stone which either imparted impetus when jumping, or were swung in the hands like dumbbells: see W–W on Mart. 7.67.6.

**422–3:** massage following exercise was standard practice, and there were masseuses, for women (Blümner 1911: 434); but J. again makes the activity into something morally dubious by having the wife use a masseur, who stimulates her sexually (cf. Mart. 7.67.8 with W–W, Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3.5.32 ‘[the women] strip naked before slaves and receive a rub-down from them, giving them . . . unrestricted licence to feel them up’). Although the *matrona* apes masculine activities she does not wish to be deprived of specifically female sexual pleasures (cf. 253–4n.). As usual in J., the Greek term (*aliptes*, from ἀλείφω, ‘anoint’) carries negative associations, underscored by *callidus*, which connotes an undesirable adroitness (*OLD* s.v. 3).

**422 cristae:** seemingly an *ad hoc* metaphor referring to the clitoris: so Adams, *LSV* 98, presumably on the basis that the organ becomes erect (like the comb of a cock), when subjected to manual stimulation (*digitos impressit*). cf. Maxim. *Eleg.* 5.98 *quo tibi cristatum uulnificumque caput?*, of the penis in a state of arousal.

**423 summum dominae femur exclamare coegit:** *summum femur* reiterates the suggestion of a sexually arousing massage: *femur* has a notably erotic colour (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 8.9–10) and *summum* indicates straying into what should be forbidden territory. 423 is often taken to refer to the slap of the masseur’s hand upon his mistress’s flesh (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 56.1 *audio crepitum illisae manus umeris*), but this seems distinctly anti-climactic after the intimacies of 422. The most plausible interpretation may be that the masseur’s attentions, involving insertion of his finger, force out a sound (*exclamare coegit*) from the woman’s genitalia: cf. the *cunnius clamosa* of Mart. 7.18 with its *poppysmata*. On the other hand, clear evidence that *femur* can be used metonymically for the pudenda is only found in late writers (*TLL* VI 1.472.67–473.6). On the considerable difficulty of 422–3 as a whole see Marzullo 1983.

**425 tandem . . . uenit:** arriving late at dinner was a social faux pas (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 725f–26a), more so if one were the hostess. The *matrona*’s keeping her guests waiting – and her generally vulgar behaviour – is reminiscent of Trimalchio (Petron. 31–3, etc.). **rubicundula** ‘all flushed’, from exercise and the attentions of the masseur (420–3n.). The adjective, found only here, is used contemptuously, without any detectable diminutive force (cf. Petersen 1917: 53–6): it suggests a contrast with the *rubicunda* complexion of the old-fashioned, morally upright *matrona*, the product of a healthy outdoor lifestyle (Ov. *Medic.* 13–14 quoted 289–90n.: cf. Mart. 10.68.3, [Quint.] *Decl. mai.* 3.3).

**425–6 totum | oenophorum sitiens** ‘thirsty enough for a whole flagon’. Exercise and also hot baths were used to promote thirst (Plin. *HN* 14.140 *per omnia haec* (exercises) *praedicatur sitis quaeri*, Sen. *Ep.* 15.3, Columella,

*Rust.* 1. *praef.* 16), which was then satisfied with copious amounts of wine (Plin., Sen. *ibid.*).

**426 plena...tenditur urna:** *tenditur* = *distenditur*, 'is stretched with a full urna': an *urna*, when brim-full, holds 24 *sextarii* or about 3 gallons (Duff).

**427 admotum pedibus:** diners reclined with their legs angled towards the back of the couch, so that the flagon was 'next to their feet' (cf. Mart. 7.20.19 *lagonam...ad pedes*), the wine being served to them by slaves, known as *ad pedes* or *a pedibus*, stationed behind the couch: see Vioque on Mart. 7.20.19.

**427-9 de quo...|...|...intestino:** the *matrona* imbibes large quantities of neat wine on an empty stomach (*ante cibum*), before vomiting it up directly, a practice of which we hear much: cf. Plin. *HN* 14.139 *plena infundere, ut statim uomant*, Sen. *Prov.* 3.13, Ath. 665e 'those persons who, after the bath, drink off wine at a single gulp and spew it forth'. One of the reasons, which were in part medical (Plin. *HN* 14.143, Ath. 665e), was to stimulate the appetite (cf. *rabidam facturum orexim*): see Sen. *Helv.* 10.3 *uomunt ut edant, edunt ut uomant*, Mart. 7.67.9-12. J. gives free rein to the disgusting nature of the regime.

**427 sextarius alter:** *alter* = 'a further, a second', so the phrase is equivalent to two *sextarii*, about two pints. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.84-5 mentions a *uini sextarius* as one of the necessities of life, but the *matrona* tosses down two at once, intending no doubt to repeat the process several times, as was apparently standard (Plin. *HN* 14.139, 29.26). Accusing someone of imbibing large quantities of wine in one go is stock invective fare (Plin. *HN* 14.144, 147, Mart 7.67.10).

**428 ducitur:** *duco*, like ἔλκω (Arnott on Alexis, fr. 88.3 K-A), suggests drinking in long draughts: cf. Ath. quoted 427-9n. **facturus orexim:** the future participle expresses purpose, a construction associated more with Greek than Latin. Gk. *orexis*, as at Juv. 11.127 - its only other occurrence in classical Latin - has connotations of unwholesome *luxuria*.

**429 dum...intestino:** 'by coming back up and hitting the ground after washing out her innards' the wine effects the purpose conveyed by *facturus orexim*: an instance of *dum* where the action of a verb in the main clause is the result of that contained in the *dum* clause (*OLD*s.v. 4). The wine served to 'purge' (*loto*: cf. κάθαρσις Ath. 665e) the intestines prior to ingestion of food. For *redire* of bringing up food or drink cf. Sen. *Ep.* 108.15. **ferit:** the forcible verb suggests something akin to projectile vomiting.

**430 marmoribus:** marble flooring (cf. Mart. 12.60.11-12 *tota surgere cena | marmora calcantem frigidiora gelu*), over which the wine which she has vomited streams. **riui properant:** ironic. The expression would normally conjure up an attractive genre scene such as Hor. *Ars P.* 17 *et properantis aquae per amoenos ambitus agros*. **Falernum:** Falernian being a first-rate wine (150n.), the detail suggests needless waste.

**430-1 aurata... | peluis:** a deluxe vessel for a loathsome physical function; cf. Mart. 1.37, 11.11.5-6. Mention of the *peluis* as a receptacle for vomit seems odd after the preceding *terram ferit intestino*.

**431-2 nam... | ...serpens:** snakes were purportedly very fond of wine (Plin. *HN* 10.198, 22.106), hence might fall into a vat of it (Columella, *Rust.* 12.31).

**432-3 ergo... | ...substringit:** the husband must close his eyes to 'hold down' his bile at the nauseating sight (and smell).

**434-56** *Even worse is the intellectual woman who forces her literary opinions on you over dinner, reducing everyone else to silence. A wife should not be educated to the same level as a man, should not be versed in rhetoric or have an encyclopaedic knowledge of literature and the finer points of grammar, so that she embarrasses her husband by dredging up obscure texts and correcting his solecisms.*

The issue of female education at Rome was deeply contentious. Many voices were raised in favour of educating women to the same level as men. But for conservatives the education of women to an advanced level was a step too far. On the whole question see intro. 46, Hemelrijk 1999.

The ideas which underlie the hostile and traditionalist attitudes, duly reflected here by J., are that over-educating females makes them uppity and interfering (435-40, 450-6), causes them to jettison their womanly sense of modesty and self-restraint (*uerecundia*, Val. Max. 8.3 *praef.*) and above all induces them to encroach on traditionally masculine activities or prerogatives (438-40), violating the cultural norms of Roman femininity (cf. the sneers of 445-7). The idea which unifies the entire section is the danger of educating women to excess (445, 450, 454-6, especially 444, which invokes the Golden Mean in support of this view) and the appalling consequences which issue therefrom.

**434 grauior:** cf. the ἄηδία, 'unpleasantness', which, according to Plutarch, *Pomp.* 55, a high-level education can produce in a woman. **discumbere coepit:** a common type of periphrasis, whereby *coepi* plus infinitive replaces a single verb used with ingressive force: cf. Petron. 49.2 *mirari nos celeritatem coepimus et iurare*, Kroll 1925: 57-9. In such expressions the force of *coepi* is often minimised, but that is not the case here. The sense is 'no sooner had she started to settle herself down for dinner than she began a conversation



on literature, instead of waiting a decent interval'. She thus proves as disruptive to enjoyment of the dinner party as the hostess of the preceding section. **discumbere**: possibly an implied criticism, as suggested by Val. Max. 2.1.2, who deplores the modern fashion of women reclining at table, whereas previously they sat.

**435** Virgil became an instant classic, integrated at once into the schools of the *grammatici* (Bonner 1977: 213–14), with whom girls studied. But the *matrona*'s choice of subject is surely dictated not just by the popularity of Virgil and of *Aeneid* 4 in particular (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.535–6 with Ingleheart), but also by its theme of illicit love (Ov. *ibid.*). Particularly shocking in the Speaker's eyes is her forgiveness of Dido, which suggests that the *matrona* has adulterous proclivities, like so many of the women in *Satire* 6, and for this reason shows greater readiness to exculpate Dido's *culpa* than did Dido herself (*Aen.* 4.547, 552). **periturae...Elissae**: the phrase echoes *Aen.* 4.610 *di morientis Elissae*. Elissa is one of Virgil's names for Dido, apparently her original Semitic one (Pease on *Aen.* 4.335).

**436** **committit uates et comparat** 'she pits the poets against each other and compares them', an analogy from the arena (Coleman on Mart. *Spect.* 34.1 *committere*, *comparat* suggests the gladiatorial *par*), inspired by Prop. 2.3.21 *et sua cum antiquae committit scripta Corinnae* and Mart. 4.23.2–3 *quis primus tibi quisue sit secundus | Graium quos epigramma comparauit*, 'has set in competition'.

**436–7 inde...|...Homerum**: such comparisons between writers were common (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.105–12, Macrobian *Sat.* 5.1, Petron. 55.5, a spoof); for Homer and Virgil in particular cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.85–6, Juv. 11.180–1, Horsfall 1979: 90. Nor were literary debates over dinner unusual either (Ath. *Deipnosophistae*, Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*). It is their source and their timing to which J. objects.

**437** *trutina* is a pair of scales with two pans for weighing (Isid. *Etym.* 16.25.4), Virgil being placed in one pan and Homer in the other. The common metaphor of weighing in the balance (cf. Skutsch 1936) is often used, as here, of evaluating the respective merits of different writers: cf. Ar. *Ran.* 1364–1410, Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.28–30, Pers. 1.6–7. *alia parte* 'on the other side' (i.e. in the other pan) balances *inde* 436. *alia* = *altera*: cf. Juv. 7.114, Kenney on Apul. *Cupid and Psyche* 5.3.5. Nisbet 1995: 243 proposes *trutinae* for *in trutina*, arguing that the second ablative after *alia parte* is less natural.

**438–43** This passage is informed by the traditional view that silence is an adornment for women (Soph. *Aj.* 293, Hawley 1999: 119–20), a belief which can assume the related forms that a wife should speak only through

her husband (398–412n.), or that her voice should be gentle, never rough-sounding in shouting or utterance (Nicostratus, *On marriage* Stob. 4.538) – injunctions which the *matrona* sensationally violates.

**438–40 cedunt...uerborum...uis:** similarly the talkative wife of Liban. *Or.* 26.16–17 ‘alone routed multitudes: she had more to say than most of them, and some she never allowed to speak at all’.

**438 cedunt grammatici:** the first persons to ‘beat a retreat’ i.e. be reduced to silence (*omnis turba | tacet* 438–9) are the *grammatici*, teachers of literature. Not only can these not compete in volume with the *matrona*, despite being known for their loud voices (Mart. 5.84.2, 9.68), but, in an additional irony, they are the persons best qualified to speak with authority about the subjects upon which the speaker expatiates. **uincuntur rhetores:** *rhetores* are teachers of rhetoric. Again the speaker ‘drowns out’ the professors. For *uinco* in this sense see Mart. 9.29.5–8 quoted 440n.

**439 nec causidicus nec praeco loquetur:** *causidici*, professional pleaders, underwent rigorous voice training (*Rhet. Her.* 3.11.20, Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.19–29, *RE* XX 522–6 s.v. *Phonaskoi*). The object was to develop a *uox...fortis ac durabilis* (Quint. 11.3.23; cf. 19). *praecones*, ‘auctioneers’ were notorious for loud, raucous voices (Rauh 1989: 460 n. 40). Notwithstanding this, both, recognising the uselessness of trying to match the speaker in volume, fall silent.

**440 altera nec mulier** ‘and not even another woman’, lent emphasis by enjambment. For *nec* = *ne quidem* (a meaning not usually associated with the conjunction when part of a sequence of *nec*’s, as here) cf. Catull. 66.72–3, *OLD* s.v. *neque* 2b. Women are generally accused of loquaciousness (190n.), rather than of having voices which are simply loud: cf. however Mart. 9.29.5–8 *heu quae lingua silet! non illam mille catastae | uincebant, nec quae turba Sarapin amat, | nec matutini cirrata caterua magistri*. **uerborum tanta cadit uis:** for the monosyllabic ending see 339n. Here the clash of ictus and accent mimics the weight and force with which the mass (*uis*) of words falls on the ear. For final monosyllables used with similar effect cf. Virg. *G.* 1.313 *cum ruit imbriferum uer*, Norden 1970: Anhang ix 3a, Hellegouarc’h 1964: 65–6.

**441–3** Super-hyperbole. The stentorinousness of her voice matches the collective din made by the banging of various implements (Plin. *HN* 2.54 *crepitu dissono*, Plut. *Aem.* 17.4), which was thought to drive off malign influences associated with the eclipse (*laboranti*) of the moon: cf. Hill 1973, Gow on Theoc. *Id.* 2.36. There is no need, says J., to resort to such expedients; her voice alone (*una* 443) will suffice. Most commonly mentioned in connection with this procedure is bronze (*aera* 442): cf. Liv. 26.5.9 *cum*

*aeris crepitu qualis in defectu lunae silenti nocte cieri solet*, Mart. 12.57.16–17; the material was chosen for its sonorousness rather than any intrinsic magical virtue: see Tupet 1976: 39–43. For the sounding of bells, *tintinnabula*, cf. RE II 6.1408 s.v. *tintinnabulum*, Dierichs 1999; for *tubae*, trumpets, Tac. Ann. 1.28.1. Basins and the like (cf. *pelues* 441) were also used for such purposes: Schol. Theoc. *Id.* 2.36.

**441** *pariter* ‘all at the same time’.

**442** *fatiget* ‘should wear out’ the trumpets and gongs by intensive use. Cf. Val. Flacc. 5.140–2 *nocte sub extrema clausis telluris ab antris | peruigil auditur Chalybum labor; arma* (‘tools’) *fatigant | ruricolae, Gradiue, tui*.

**444** J. invokes a respectable philosophical ideal (cf. *sapiens*) to justify a questionable position, that females should not be too highly educated (*docta nimis* 445). For Aristotle and his followers, excellence lay somewhere between defect and excess (*Eth. Nic.* 1106b36–1107a2, Cic. *Off.* 1.89 *medicritatem illam . . . quae est inter nimium et parum, quae placet Peripateticis et recte placet*, N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.10.5). J. may also have in mind the objections of Seneca, *Ep.* 88.36–7: *plus scire uelle quam sit satis, intemperantiae genus est. quid? quod ista liberalium artium consecratio molestos, uerbosos, intempestiuos, sibi placentes facit*, faults of which the *matrona* is guilty.

**445** *cupit . . . uideri*: not only is she excessively erudite and eloquent, she desires to parade the fact. Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 36 complains of women who make a show of learning, but in contrast to here (cf. 448–56), it is a matter more of appearance than substance.

**446–7**: a sarcastic way of saying that she is encroaching on strictly male concerns. Cf. the nickname Androgyne given to Maesia of Sentinum for similar encroachment (242–5n.).

**446** She should wear her tunic like a man, the male *tunica* being gathered about the waist by a belt (cf. *succingere*) whereas the female tunic, worn under the *stola*, was for reasons of modesty far longer: cf. Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.138, Gell. NA 6.12.1 *feminisque solis uestem* [i.e. *tunicam*] *longe lateque diffusam decere existimauerunt ad ulnas cruraque aduersus oculos protegenda*, Wilson 1938: 59, Scholz 1992: 93–100.

**447** *caedere Siluano porcum*: i.e. engage in a ritual reserved for men. Although there is extensive evidence for female devotees of Silvanus (Dorcey 1989), a number of sources state that women were prohibited from sacrificing to the god (Cato, *Agr.* 83, Schol. Juv. 6.447) or otherwise impute misogyny to him (August. *De civ. D.* 6.9, CIL VI 579). *caedere porcum* cannot be taken to suggest that the pig was Silvanus’ usual sacrificial victim: it is clear from art that all kinds of animal would suit; cf. Dorcey

1992: 27. **quadrante lauari**: she should bathe like a man: a quarter of an *as* (*quadrans*) was traditionally the standard admission fee to the baths for males (Cic. *Cael.* 62, Mart. 8.42), women being charged more (*CIL* II 5181.22–3). Cf. Nielsen 1993: 1131–5.

**448–9 non habeat... | dicendi genus** ‘let her not have her own rhetorical style’ i.e. ‘let her not have a rhetorical training’. *genus* refers to the familiar *tria genera dicendi* (*grande, medium, subtile*): see Lausberg §1079.

**448 tibi quae iuncta recumbit**: your wife; cf. Juv. 11.165, Roller 2003.

**449–50 aut curuum... | ...enthymema**: a type of rhetorical argument, an *enthymema* is an incomplete syllogism (Arist. *Rh.* 1419a19, Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.3, Lausberg §371), i.e. it does not contain all of the latter’s constituent parts (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 5.14.24–6). Although Quintilian, *Inst.* 5.10.1 expresses a preference for Greek *enthymema* over its Latin synonyms, its use here is deliberate, suggesting possession of specialised knowledge which, in J.’s view, the *matrona* would be better off without, and which she uses to score points off her husband. *curuum* refers to the ‘rounding off’ of the logical proof which concludes the *enthymema* (cf. Schol. *in se reuoluitur atque concludit*, Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.102), but may also suggest the tedious tortuousness of the argument (*OLD* s.v. 2). **rotato | torqueat**: both *rotare* and *torquere* use the familiar metaphor of words as weapons: cf. Cic. *De or.* 1.242 *a quo cum amentatas hastas acceperit, ipse eas oratoris lacertis uiribusque torquebit*, Brut. 271, Sen. *Ep.* 108.10, Pl. *Prt.* 342e. The weapon of choice in this image is the javelin. *torquere*, ‘hurl’ refers strictly speaking to the spiralling motion imparted to the spear by the thong, *amentum*, from which it was fired (Hollis on Ov. *Met.* 8.28–9). *rotare* properly describes a whirling movement. *rotato* is sometimes translated ‘brandishing’, in reference to ‘whirling’ a weapon round and round before deployment (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 9.441–2). But one does not perform any such action with a javelin. The sense is rather ‘to cause to move onward with a rolling or spinning motion’ (*OLD* s.v. 3a), *sermone rotato* forming part of a single sense unit with *torquet*, ‘nor launch phrases and hurl a syllogism’.

**450 nec historias sciat omnes**: *historiae* are ‘stories’, the elucidation of which, calling for knowledge of a wide range of topics, above all mythology and history (Marquardt 1886: 107–8, Bonner 1977: 237–40), was the province of the *grammaticus*: cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.18–21, who appositely remarks that to ferret out the most obscure variants of a *historia* is a mark of ‘tireless pedantry or useless ostentation’ (18).

**451 sed quaedam... et non intelligat**: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 640–1 ‘may there not be in my house a woman who has more wit than a woman should’, also

Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.21 *mihi inter uirtutes grammatici habebitur aliqua nescire. et* means ‘in addition to the many things that she does understand’.

**451–2 odi | hanc ego quae** ‘this is the woman I particularly can’t stand – the one who’. *ego* is enclitic, i.e. instead of preceding its verb, it is postponed and attached to a ‘host’ (*hanc*) to which it lends emphasis. For the usage see Adams 1994: 141–4. Cf. 651 for a similar effect.

**452 repetit... Palaemonis artem** ‘who keeps on referring to and unrolls (*OLD* s.v. *uoluo* 9a) Palaemon’s manual’ (ancient books took the form of a papyrus roll). Q. Remmius Palaemon, a notable *grammaticus* (Suet. *Gram.* 23, Juv. 7.215–16: *fl.* first half of the first century AD), composed a technical treatise on grammar (*ars grammatica*, *Rhet. Her.* 4.12.17) which, to judge from the fragments tentatively attributed to it (Mazzarino 1955: 73–102), was characterised by dry-as-dust pedantry (e.g. the discussion of *numquam* 81) – though this was a feature of Roman grammatical instruction in general.

**453** Technical language, ‘always observing the rules and laws of grammar’. Quintilian defines one of the two tasks of the *grammaticus* as imparting instruction *de ratione Latine atque emendate loquendi* (*Inst.* 8.1.2: cf. 1.9.1).

**454 ignotosque mihi tenet antiquaria uersus** ‘an antiquarian, she remembers (*OLD* s.v. *teneo* 24) verses I have never heard of’, one more example of wifely one-upmanship. Romans tended to over-estimate writers of earlier times, poets especially, at the expense of contemporary authors: cf. Horace’s complaints in the *Epistle to Augustus*, Quint. *Inst.* 8.2.12, Rimell 2008 on Martial. But the archaising movement of the first century AD was now moving towards its apogee (Williams 1978: 306–12) and the bluestocking’s self-image demands that she be *au fait* with this.

**455 nec curanda uiris:** emphatic enjambment, ‘and things that men need not trouble themselves about’ (having more important matters to concern them).

**455–6 opicae... | uerba:** *castigare* normally involves correcting morals, not language (Brink on Hor. *Ars P.* 294). *opicus* was originally an ethnic, an early form of *Oscus*, the Oscans, for reasons variously explained, being poorly esteemed. It was subsequently used by Greeks (and Romans) to disparage Romans who did not understand Greek; finally, since Greeks were viewed as the repositories of culture *tout court*, coming to mean ‘ignorant, philistine’, its sense here. Cf. Dubuisson 1983, Swain 2004: 38–9.

**456 soloecismum liceat fecisse marito:** the implication is that she pounces on any such mistake on the husband’s part: a debunking conclusion, suggesting that the Speaker fears humiliation by a woman (cf. 454), which

does much to undermine the vitriol of the preceding lines. **soloe-cismum**: an error in syntax (Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.34–54, esp. 37, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* 3.214.22 von Arnim). The term transliterates σολοικισμός, derived from the town of Soli in Cilicia, whose inhabitants spoke a corrupt form of Greek (von Hüttenbach 1976: 336–9). Teachers of grammar were much exercised by the issue of solecisms (*Rhet. Her.* 4.12.17, Bonner 1977: 202–4), which might be defined in a very nit-picking fashion (Charpin 1978: 214–15). So on both counts there is again an imputation of niggling pedantry. It is therefore ironic that antiquarians regarded the older form *soloecum* as the correct form of the term (Gell. *NA* 5.20). **fecisse** = *facere*. In Republican Latin the perfect infinitive was often used with the force of a present infinitive after *uolo* and *nolo*, but from the Augustan poets onwards, partly for metrical convenience, the usage was extended to all verbs governing an infinitive: cf. Ov. *Fast.* 6.230 *non unguis ferro subsecuisse licet*, K–S 1.133–4.

**457–73** *There's no depravity a woman won't sink to when she puts on her expensive jewellery. She makes herself ready to go out by applying cosmetics, not caring whether she appears ugly before her husband, because all this is done for the benefit of the lover she's going to meet. But with all the skin preparations, you wonder whether her face shouldn't be called an ulcerated sore.*

J. draws in this section on a long-standing tradition – going back at least to Xenophon (*Oec.* 10.2–9) – of hostility to female καλλωπισμός, self-beautification, a term which embraces fine clothing, jewellery, cosmetics and careful attention to hairstyle ('Phintys' Stob. 4.591–2, Plut. *Praeconiug.* 141e, 'Periktione the Pythagorean' Stob. 4.689–90, Olson 2008: 80–95). Two ideas are of especial pertinence:

- (1) There is a direct link between a woman's self-adornment and adultery (e.g. Lys. 1.14, Nicostratus, *On marriage* Stob. 4.593–4, Antiphan. fr. 262 K–A, Petron. 55.6.9–16, Sen. *Helv.* 16.3–4, *Ben.* 7.9.4–5, Grillet 1975: 100–1): an idea sometimes particularised in the argument, made in 464–6, that wives beautify themselves only for their lovers, not their husbands; cf. Hyp. Stob. 4.581 'καλλωπισμοί prior to exiting the house, that are employed no longer for a husband, but for strangers, are to be feared', 'Periktione' Stob. 4.689–90, Lucil. 504–5 Marx *cum tecum est, quiduis satis est: uisuri alieni | sint homines, spiram, pallas, redimicula promit*, Tib. 1.9.65–74, Kapparis 2002: 116.
- (2) Female cosmetics are intrinsically unwholesome, a thought developed *in extenso* by J. here: cf. Mart. 6.93.7–10, Richlin 1995: 188–93, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.9–11 and the passages cited 461–73n.

At a more general level, the taste for expensive jewellery and exotic perfumes which J.'s women here exhibit was widely seen as emblematic of

the ruinous *luxuria* which had invaded Rome from the East (cf. *Indi* 466; Petron. 55.6.9–16, Columella, *Rust.* 12 *praef.* 7–9, Plin. *HN* 13.20–5, Brown on Lucr. 4.1126). Hence the passage as a whole connects with the attack on *luxus* in 286–300.

**457–9:** in making the traditional connection between the wearing of jewels and sexual promiscuity (457–73n.), J. ignores the fact that upper-class women commonly wore expensive jewellery (cf. intro. 47) – though excessive use could attract disapprobation. Pearls (459) and emeralds (458) are often, as here, mentioned together in a pejorative context, e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.80, Plin. *HN* 9.117, Barini 1958: 40; that they came mainly from the East (see Plin. *HN* 37.65; [Sen.] *HO* 661–2), with its associations of luxury and depravity, enhanced their morally dubious character: see Watson 2007b: 380–1, Olson 2008: 83–5.

**457 *turpe putat nil*:** as often, *turpis* refers specifically to sexual immorality (cf. 97, 241, O3).

**458 *uirides gemmas*:** emeralds, as at Mart. 9.59.17 and 11.27.10. They were among the most highly prized gems in Rome: cf. Lucr. 4.1126–7 with Brown, Plin. *HN* 37.62. ***collo circumdedit*:** beads of emerald were made into necklaces, such as those found at Pompeii: see Higgins 1980: 180; on necklaces see also Barini 1958: 49–64. For the disapproval underlying 457–8 cf. Naumachius Stob. 4.573 vv. 1–2 ‘you [the good wife] should not have upon your neck... green jasper’.

**459 *auribus extensis*:** the earlobes are elongated with the weight of the pearls, which might be in multiple tiers (Sen. *Ben.* 7.9.4, Plin. cited next n.): cf. Sen. *Phaed.* 391–2 *nec niueus lapis | deducat aures, Indici donum maris*, [Sen.] *HO* 661–2, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 8.14. ***magnos... elenchos*:** long, pear-shaped pearls used for earrings: cf. Plin. *HN* 9.113–14 *elenchos appellat fastigata longitudine alabastrorum figura in plenior orbem desinentes. hos digitis suspendere et binos ac ternos auribus feminarum gloria est*. For an illustration see Higgins 1980: 179 fig. 26; see also Barini 1958: 40–5. Their size enhanced their value (Plin. *ibid.* 112).

**460** to be deleted as a marginal comment: see Watson 2007b: 377 n. 8.

**461–73** A further striking example of the way in which J. distorts reality for satiric purposes. Most Roman women will have used skin-care preparations (Richlin 1995: 197–200), and recipes are included in technical writers such as Galen (e.g. 14.422–3 Kühn) and Dioscorides, as well as Ovid’s *Medicamina faciei femineae*, addressed to *matronae*. Any cosmetics, whether make-up or, as here, creams and face-packs, were, however, regarded with suspicion in some quarters because they involved artifice, the employment of drugs, and expense; above all, a woman who beautified herself

was assumed to be doing so in order to attract a lover (cf. Sen. *Helv.* 16.4 *non faciem coloribus ac lenociniis polluisti*, 457–73n.) – whence Ovid’s caution *Medic.* 23–8 that women should use cosmetics solely for the benefit of their husbands. See further Watson 2007b: 378 and n. 9.

J. duly exploits this anti-cosmetic tradition. His description of a facepack (467–73), for instance, is typical in representing as repellent both the cosmetics themselves and the woman at the moment of applying them: cf. Nicostratus, *On marriage* Stob. 4.594, Eubul. fr. 97 K–A, Ov. *Rem. am.* 353–6 *pyxidas inuenies et rerum mille colores | et fluere in tepidos oesyra lapsa sinus. | illa tuas redolent, Phineu, medicamina, mensas; | non semel hinc stomacho nausea facta meo est*, *Ars* 3.211–12 with Gibson, 457–73n. But whereas in the above passages the woman’s make-up merely runs, J. turns such scenes into comedy, depicting the husband attempting to kiss his wife and getting his lips stuck in the gooey facecream. Moreover, a moral dimension is added by substituting Poppaeian cream for Ovid’s lanolin (*Rem. am.* 354; cf. *Ars* 3.213) or deer marrow (*Ars* 3.215), thus foreshadowing the reference to Poppaea’s asses and the morally dubious associations of Poppaea herself (468–70n.). Finally, the libertine character of the woman’s behaviour (cf. 464–6) is also emphasised by intertextuality with Ovid’s didactic poems, addressed to *demi-mondaines*: this assimilates her, as often in *Satire* 6, to an elegiac *puella*. See further, Wyke 1994, Olson 2008: 58–79.

**461 interea** “in preparation” i.e. before she goes abroad in all her charms’ Duff. But the transition between the topic of jewellery 458–9 and the (admittedly related) one of cosmetics 461–73 is abrupt: moreover, the disproportion in length between the treatment of the two themes is discomfiting. The suggestion of Teuffel 1865: 478 that some text has dropped out between 459 and 461 which gave meaning to *interea* has much to recommend it. **foeda aspectu:** cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.217–18 *ista [cosmetics] dabunt formam, sed erunt deformia uisu, | multaque, dum fiunt turpia, facta placent*.

**461–2 ridendaque ... | ... facies** ‘her face is laughably swollen with a mass of dough’. *ridenda* calls to mind Lucretius’ satiric account of a woman performing her toilette behind closed doors *quam famulae longe fugitant furtimque cachinnant* (4.1176).

**462 pane tumet facies:** facepacks were made from a variety of ingredients, and bread was used for this purpose by Otho (472–3n., Juv. 2.107). But J. probably chose this type of facepack to foreshadow the comparison of the woman’s face with an *ulcus* (473), since ulcers were likewise associated with swelling (cf. *tumet*) and treated with bread poultices (Celsus, *Med.* 5.18.19; Watson 2007b: 386 and n. 40). **pinguia:** in a double sense, ‘rich, greasy’ (cf. Mart. 11.15.6) and ‘sticky’ (e.g. of birdlime, Mart. 9.54.4 *pinguis et implicitas uirga teneret auis*: cf. 463n. *uiscantur*): the epithet is also chosen



for purposes of alliteration. Face creams were often made of greasy substances: cf. Plin. *HN* 28.183-5, and in an anti-cosmetic context, Ov. *Ars* 3.211-15, *Rem. am.* 354. **Poppaeana:** apparently a kind of face cream, real or imagined, which was invented by, or perhaps named after, Nero's wife Poppaea. Cf. the perfumed unguent called *Cosmianum* after its inventor Cosmus (Mart. 11.15.6, also 6.55.3 *plumbea Nicerotiana* with Grewing). The allusion prepares the way for the reference in 468-70 to asses' milk, for the use of which Poppaea was famous.

**463 spirat** (+ acc. *OLD* 4b) 'gives off a smell of', used mostly of pleasant odours (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.403-4), but here of a bad smell: in moralising contexts, the stink of cosmetics is often noted (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.9-11), one reason why men were advised to avoid a woman when at her toilette: cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.208-13, *Rem. am.* 353-6 (461-73n.). **hinc...uiscantur:** cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.391 *non auis utiliter uiscatis effugit alis*. When he kisses her, the husband's lips are stuck in the sticky cream as if in birdlime: nicely ironic in view of the fact that it is normally a *lover* whom the *puella* wishes to catch by hunting (Watson 2007b: 384 n. 32).

**464-6:** best regarded as a parenthesis.

**464 moechum** (42n.) is pointedly contrasted with *mariti* at the end of the preceding line. **lota** (Gk. φαιδρύνεσθαι) = washed clean of the cosmetic preparations.

**464-5 quando uideri | uult formonsa domi?** in wishing to appear beautiful before her lover rather than her husband, the woman is again portrayed as the inverse of the ideal *matrona*: cf. 162n. for *formositas* as a characteristic of the exemplary *uxor*, and Ovid's advice (461-73n.) that a modern wife should use cosmetics only for the benefit of her husband.

**465 foliata:** *foliatum* was an expensive unguent manufactured from the leaves of several aromatic plants, especially nard: see Plin. *HN* 13.15, Mart. 11.27.9 with Kay.

**466 his** 'for their benefit'. As with cosmetics and jewellery, the use of perfumes was associated with adultery (Olson 2008: 78), sweet smells having an erotically arousing effect (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 12.9-11). **emittitur quidquid:** that wives are lavish with money is a common theme in *Sat.* 6 (149-60, 232, 508-11, 352-65n.). Perfumes were a symbol of *luxuria* (Plin. *HN* 13.25). **graciles:** for the thinness of Indians, cf. Arrian, *Indica* 17.1. **mittitis** 'export': cf. Virg. *G.* 1.56-7 *nonne uides, croceos ut Tmolus odores*, | *India mittit ebur?*, Juv. 11.124. **Indi:** although perfumes could be obtained from all over the Roman world, J. chooses the most exotic, Eastern provenance to exploit the association of those regions with *luxuria*. Cf. 'Phintys' Stob. 4.592: a good wife 'should not brighten her complexion

with imported and foreign pigments’, [Lucian,] *Amores* 40: women spend their husbands’ wealth on scenting their hair with all the perfumes of Arabia; Olson 2008: 76–7, 88.

**467 aperit uultum:** cf. Nicostratus, *On marriage* Stob. 4.594 a wife should ‘not feel the need of white lead...or other colouring agent which...*conceals* the eyes/face’. **tectoria prima reponit** ‘takes off the top layers of plaster/stucco’. *prima* suggests that there are several layers, enough to hide her face; as she takes them off she gradually becomes recognisable (*incipit agnoscere*). For the image cf. Petron. 23.5 *inter rugas malarum tantum erat cretae, ut putares detectum parietem nimbo laborare*.

**468–70 illo lacte...ad axem:** in the context, this must refer to the use of asses’ milk as a face-cleanser: according to Pliny (*HN* 28.183) some women washed their face (*fouere*) with the milk seven times a day. The number of asses accompanying the woman, however, also recalls Pliny’s story (*ibid.*) of how Poppaea, wife of Nero, travelled with a cohort of these, so that she could take baths in the milk. In alluding to Poppaea, J. exploits the morally dubious connotations of her name (cf. Plin. *HN* 11.238, Tac. *Ann.* 13.45, Dio Cass. 62.28). The pejorative effect is reinforced by the allusion to exile – the punishment for adultery under the Augustan marital legislation. See also Watson 2007b: 384–6.

**468 lacte:** according to Pliny, asses’ milk was thought effective in removing wrinkles, and whitening and softening the skin (*HN* 11.238, 28.183). It is still used in skincare products by a small number of producers who make great claims for its cosmetic properties.

**469 comites:** it was customary for the banished to take with them a friend as *comes exilii* (cf. Mart. 2.24.3–4 with Williams, Sen. *Ep.* 9.10, Drogula 2011: 239 n. 42); in the case of a woman, this might be her mother or her sisters. Here she-asses are substituted, such is the woman’s vanity. J. sardonically applies to the animals (who have no choice in the matter) a *topos* of friendship- and exile-literature: a true *amicus* (or wife) is ready to accompany one to the ends of the earth (cf. Yardley 1981). **educat:** Housman’s convincing emendation for *educit*, to balance the subjunctive in the protasis. **asellas:** in contrast to a single *comes exilii*, asinine *comites* would run to several hundred! Pliny states that Poppaea kept 500 animals for her baths (*HN* 11.238, 28.183 *asinarum gregibus*), a not entirely fanciful number, since a donkey which has foaled produces less than one litre of milk a day.

**470 Hyperboreum...ad axem:** to the North Pole. The Hyperboreans represent the northern extremity of the world (Catull. 115.6 with Fordyce).

**471–3** J. humorously enquires whether the woman's face, treated as it is with medicaments, should be called a face or an ulcerated sore. For maximum impact, the key term, *ulcus*, is held back till the last word, but the comparison between face and *ulcus* is prepared for by the use of terms which can be applied alike to cosmetics and to medical treatments (see 462n. *pane tumet facies*, and below). Further point is given to *ulcus* by the injurious effects which many ancient cosmetics had on women's skin (Olson 2009): both literally and figuratively the face is a sore.

**471 quae:** in a deliberate blurring of semantic categories, the postponement of the antecedent *facies*, allied to the fact that all the finite verbs in the preceding sentence refer to the *uxor*, invites the false expectation that *quae* means 'she who': an expectation only exploded in 473.

**471–2 mutatis... | tot medicaminibus:** the bread poultice (462), the Pop-paeon face cream (462), and the asses' milk (468), applied 'one after the other' (*mutatis*). Medical treatments for ulcers (cf. 473) also involved a variety of different regimes, e.g. Celsus, *Med.* 5.28.4 recommends opening the pustules, applying various medications to clean out the rotten flesh, then applying soothing ointments.

**471 inducitur** 'is coated' (*OLD* s.v. 16b). The verb is also used by Celsus, *Med.* 5.9 of substances which cause scabs to form over ulcers (*crustas ulceribus... inducunt*). **fouetur:** Nisbet 1995: 243–4 proposes *nouatur*: he objects to the repetition of *fouetur* on the grounds that it is used appropriately in 468 of bathing the face in soothing milk, but is inappropriate in reference to 'sticky plasters'. But *coctae... siliginis offas... et madidae* are not exactly 'sticky plasters' (see *ad loc.*) and, in a deliberate confusion of the boundaries between facepacks and medical treatments (471–3n.), J. here chooses a verb which is also employed in medical writings of applying a soothing application to wounds (Celsus, *Med.* 5.28.4D, *OLD foueo* 3a).

**472–3 coctaeque siliginis... | ...et madidae** 'lumps of heated and moist bread': a reference to the facepack (*pane*) of 462. Otho's face treatment was made of moistened bread (Suet. *Oth.* 12 *quin et faciem cotidie rasitare ac pane madido linere consuetum*), but neither this nor any other known facepack (e.g. Gal. 14.422 Kühn, also using *siligo*) involves heating, and, in a further anticipation of the sneering *ulcus*, *coctae* suggests rather a hot bread poultice used to treat sores (see Gal. 13.731 Kühn; cf. Celsus, *Med.* 5.28.13C, Sor. ap. Gal. 14.494 Kühn).

**474–507** *If her husband withholds sex, she takes out her anger on the slaves, who are thrashed, as she attends to other, trivial matters. Her cruelty towards them matches that of the Sicilian tyrants. If she has made an assignation and her hair is not to her satisfaction, her hairdresser is beaten. Such is her concern for her coiffure that*

*a council of domestics is convened to advise. Her towering hairstyle makes her look like an Andromache from the front: from the back, she could be as short as a Pygmy.*

Anger was allegedly a vice to which women were especially prone, a charge already given an extensive airing (268–70, 413–19). It generates the dominant idea of this section, that mistresses are driven by ill-temper to inflict ferocious beatings and other forms of physical harm on their *serui*: cf. Herodas, *Mimiamb.* 5, the Μοιχεύτρια-mime (*P. Oxy.* 413 verso cols. 1–3), Petron. 132.5, Apul. *Met.* 3.16, Harris 2001: 271. Frequently, as here, the underlying motives for such irascibility and cruelty are sexual.

J. develops the stereotype of the cruel mistress with characteristic hyperbole: torturers receive an annual retainer (480), the *materfamilias* attends to quotidian activities while presiding over pitiless beatings (481–4), these go on so long that the *tortores* become exhausted (484), the mistress's ferocity equals that of Phalaris (486). The section is a brilliant example of how J. reinforces his argument by creating a scene which is a lurid and misogynistic distortion of reality. The reality in this case is that owners routinely subjected their slaves to corporal punishment (cf. Watson 2007b: 387 n. 41), while wives had their own slaves to carry out female activities (Treggiari 1976: 84) and will have attended to their disciplining (cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 261). This said, capricious or excessive punishment of slaves was condemned by moralists (Watson 2007b: 387 n. 43), and though a case is recorded of a *matrona* who was exiled by Hadrian for maltreating her *ancillae* (Ulp. *Dig.* 1.6.2), the majority of instances where *saevitia* was visited upon slaves involved male owners (see Hopkins 1978: 118–23, Bradley 1987: 113–37, Saller 1991: 158–60), undermining J.'s representation of the scenario here as typical female behaviour.

The elegy-inspired attack by the mistress on her *ornatrix* (490–5) segues in 495–506 into parodic sneers about the excessive care which the *matrona* bestows on her hairstyle. Here J. is drawing, as in 457–73, on the anti-cosmetic tradition, where strictures against over-complex capillary arrangements, or simply devoting excessive attention to the hair, are widespread. Instances include Semon. fr. 7.63–6 W, [Lucian,] *Amores* 40, 'but most of [women's] efforts are spent on dressing their hair', 'Periktione the Pythagorean' Stob. 4.689–90, Naumachius Stob. 4.573.5–6 the wife should 'part her hair by hand and ... not plait her locks into elaborate coils'. Such strictures are also prominent in Roman elegy (cf. Tib. 1.9.67–8, Prop. 1.15.5–8, 2.18B.23–32, Gibson 2003: 149), where 'hair's erotic potential made it a lightening [*sic*] rod for anxieties about female sexuality' (Bartman 2001: 5), in the sense that elaborate beautification of the hair was, as in 487–9, linked to infidelity.

**474–5 est pretium curae ... | ... die:** the implication is that their whole day is devoted to vacuous activities, especially their toilet. Cf. Plaut. *Poen.*

210–31, Antiphan. fr. 146 K–A, [Lucian,] *Amores* 39 ‘for they do not wash off the torpor of sleep... and immediately apply themselves to some serious type of activity [but spend an eternity making up their faces and dressing their hair]’.

**474 est pretium curae** ‘it is worth while’, a variant on the more familiar *operae pretium est*.

**475–6 si... | auersus iacuit:** code for ‘declined to have intercourse’ as in Luc. 5.736, Lucian, *Dial. meret.* 11.1 and the comparable ‘sleep at the edge of the bed’ (Prop. 3.21.8 etc.).

**476 periit:** a third person version of the exclamation of comic slaves about to suffer punishment, *perii*, ‘I am done for’. **libraria:** according to the *Scholia uetera* (ap. Jahn 1851), this refers to the *lanipendia*, who weighed out the *pensum* [the amount of wool to be spun in a day] for the female slaves and also had a supervisory rôle over wool-manufacture in the house (Treggiari 1976: 82–4).

**476–7 ponunt | ...tunicas:** in preparation for beating: cf. Plaut. *Persa* 362–3, Sen. *De ira* 3.12.5 *Plato... cum seruo suo irasceretur... ponere illum statim tunicam et praebere scapulas uerberibus iussit*.

**477 cosmetae:** male slaves whose function was to adorn (κοσμέω) their mistress by applying make-up, putting on jewellery and arranging her hair (Durry 1969).

**477–8 tarde uenisse Liburnus | dicitur:** cf. Amm. Marc. 28.4.16: slaves beaten for being slow to bring the hot water – though in the present case the ‘lateness’ is an invention (*dicitur*). *Liburnus* is a Liburnian (Illyrian) slave, whose rôle here is unspecified: cf. Watson 2007b: 388 n. 50.

**478 alieni:** the husband’s (475–6).

**479–80** To balance the trio of slaves who are made to pay for the *materfamilias*’ ill-temper (476–8), three standard implements of punishment (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.117–21) are mentioned, the rod (*ferula*), the lash (*flagellum*) and the strap (*scutica*) – though the subjects here, in contrast to 476–7, are all male, so that the tally of victims, and hence the impression of the wife’s indiscriminate cruelty, is increased. The ferocity of the beatings is brought out by *frangit* (‘has broken upon him’) and *rubet*, as well as by *flagello*, a fearsome instrument quite disproportionate to the ‘crime’ (Hor. *ibid.*, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 4.11).

**480 sunt... praestent:** some *matronae* so frequently require the services of the *tortores*, public slaves charged with administering punishment to other slaves, that, rather than paying them for each individual job, they

give them an annual salary (*annua*: cf. Plin. *Ep.* 10.31.2 *quidam uel in opus damnati... etiam ut publici serui annua accipiunt*).

**481 uerberat:** has them beaten. Cf. *rapere... concidere* 414n. **obiter** ‘all the while’ (*OLD* s.v. 2), suggesting her casual indifference to the beatings. *et caedit* below, appended as if an afterthought, makes the same point.

**482** ‘or she inspects the broad golden stripe on an embroidered (*pictae* sc. *acu*) dress’, a *uestis auro clauata* (cf. Olson 2008: 51), possibly brought for her perusal by an itinerant *institor*, for whom cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.421–2, also Sette 2000: 16, fig. 14, where a seated figure examines a piece of cloth which two sellers are holding up for inspection. The detail, like *faciem linit*, continues the attack on beautification which is central to 457–506. **considerat:** of careful inspection. Cf. Suet. *Calig.* 36.2 *quas... diligenter ac lente mercantium more considerabat*.

**483 longi...diurni:** lit. ‘she reads through the verticality of her long account book’. Convincingly explained by Turner 1978: 31, whom Courtney follows (see his n. and diagram *ad loc.*), as a reference, not, as often supposed, to the *acta diurna*, but to a daily ledger of accounts (*cotidianum diurnum*, Sen. *Contr.* 10.4.24), which was read from top to bottom, in the manner of a degree scroll, rather than in parallel columns running horizontally from left to right, as was the case with a papyrus roll (*transuersa* = swivelled through an angle of 90° in relation to the roll). Roman wives oversaw management of the household expenses: cf. *ILS* 8393 col. 1, 8440.4, 8444, 8445.

**484 lassis caedentibus:** indicating the uncalled-for prolongation of the beatings. For *lassus* in a similar context, cf. Juv. 8.137 ‘*exi*’: addressed to a victim of her anger-inspired floggings, whence ‘the thunderous and fearsome tones’ (485) with which she dismisses him.

**485 intonet horrendum:** parodies Virg. *Aen.* 12.700 *horrendumque intonat armis*. **cognitione:** the beating of the slaves is parodically likened to a *cognitio*, the hearing of a legal case by a magistrate. In J.’s day, those of humble status charged with an offence were tried by the *praefectus urbi* or *praefectus uigilum* (cf. *praefectura* 486). In the case of slaves, whether giving evidence or accused of a crime, beating and torture were standard procedure. Cf. Jones 1972: 114–15, Watson 2007b: 389.

**486 Sricula non mitior aula** ‘no gentler than that of a Sicilian court’, a compendious comparison, referring to the proverbial (Hor. *Epist.* 1.2.58–9) cruelty of Sicilian tyrants: J. is thinking particularly of Phalaris of Acragas, who roasted his victims alive in a brazen bull: cf. Juv. 8.81–2, Berve 1967: 1129–32.

**487 nam si:** see 415n. **constituit** ‘has made an assignation’; cf. Juv. 3.12 *ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicae*.

**487–8 solitoque decentius optat | ornari:** continues a theme of the preceding section, that especial care over appearance is for the benefit of a lover, not a husband.

**488 iamque expectatur in hortis:** Cic. *Cael.* 36 implies that gardens were good places to encounter lovers; Ov. *Ars* 1.67 recommends the shady garden walks of Pompey’s portico as an excellent spot for meeting the opposite sex: cf. *Ars* 3.387–8 with Gibson.

**489 apud Isiacae ... sacraria lenae:** Isis is called *lena*, ‘procuress’, because her temple was allegedly, as here, a spot for assignations (Juv. 9.22–4, Mart. 11.47.4, Ov. *Ars* 1.77–8 and 3.635–6 with Gibson for the goddess’s supposed popularity among elegiac *puellae*). Although there was in reality a marked emphasis within the cult on sexual continence (Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 351f–352a, Heyob 1975: 119–27), J.’s sneer is not entirely without justification. Witt 1971: 85–6 remarks that there was a frankly erotic dimension to Isis-worship and notes that ‘the shrines at Pompeii are not far from brothels’: Becher 1970: 82–3 cites inscriptions where Isis is said to bring men and women together.

**490** A neat anthithesis. While dressing her mistress’s hair, the *ornatrix* has her own torn by the mistress, displeased with her efforts. For one woman tearing the hair of another in a rage cf. Prop. 4.8.61. The main inspiration for the assault on Psecas in 490–5 is passages of elegy where bad-tempered *puellae* ferociously attack the slave girls who dress their hair (Ov. *Am.* 1.14.13–18, *Ars* 3.237–42 with Gibson; see also 493n.). The effect is once more to assimilate the adulterous *matrona* to the *meretrix* of elegy.

**491 nuda ... nudisque:** stripped for the beating with the *taurea* 492 (cf. 476–7), presumably by a *tortor*. One of the arguments used by Ovid in attempting to persuade Corinna that he is not sleeping with her hairdresser Cypassis is *quis Veneris famulae conubia liber inire | tergaque complecti uerbere secta uelit?* (*Am.* 2.7.21–2). **Psecas:** a ‘speaking name’ for the hairdresser, who περάζει, ‘drops’ oil upon the hair. See further Courtney.

**492 taurea:** sc. *scutica*, a strap made of bull’s hide, possibly with a pun on the brazen bull of Phalaris (486n.).

**493 flexi crimen facinusque capilli:** resumes the mock-legal hyperbole of 485–6. For the comic alliteration, cf. Apul. *Apol.* 4 *crinium crimen. facinus* derives from Mart. 2.66.1–4 *unus de toto peccauerat orbe comarum | anulus, incerta non bene fixus acu. | hoc facinus Lalage speculo, quo uiderat, ulta est, | et*

*cecidit saevis icta Plecusa comis. altior* 492 explains the nature of the curl's 'crime'. See further on 495–6.

**494** *quid Psecas admisit?* 'What wrong has Psecas done?' (*OLD* s.v. *admitto* 13a).

**494–5** *quaenam... | ...nasus tuus?* the *matrona*, inspecting her hair in the mirror as the *ornatrix* arranges it (cf. Mart. 2.66 quoted 493n.), finds the shape of her nose displeasing and takes out her anger on the *ancilla*, inventing the excuse that she has mis-dressed one lock.

**495** *altera*: the normal procedure was for one *ornatrix* to attend to her mistress's coiffure (Kampen 1981: 149–52; cf. 497–501n.), but more than one hairdresser was required to create the elaborate style in question here (Stephens 2008: 124; cf. also Macrob. *Sat.* 2.5.7).

**495–6** *altera laeuum | ... orbem* 'a second [slave girl] teases out the pernicious curl and combs the hair and rolls it into the orb', i.e. she fixes the offending curl of 492 (see below) so that it is correctly positioned in the overall coiffure. The passage is difficult. *orbis* must refer, as in Mart. 2.66 (quoted 493n.), to the hairstyle in which the hair was arranged in elaborate tiered curls (*cincinnus* 492, *flexi... capilli* 493), rising high above the brow so as to encircle it in the manner of an orb (cf. 502–4n.). As to *laeuum*, the translation we have offered supposes that this refers to the *cincinnus* of 492 and has the meaning 'pernicious' (*OLD* s.v. 5; cf. Juv. 14.228 *laeuo monitu*), in the sense that it has already caused Psecas to come to grief. The *cincinnus* is thus personified, as in Mart. 2.66.1–2 *unus de toto peccauerat orbe comarum | anulus* (cf. also Ov. *Ars* 3.242 [*ornatrix*] *plorat in inuisas sanguinolenta [dominae] comas*). Courtney, comparing Juv. 11.140–1, conjoins *laeuum* with *orbem*, but both construction and hyperbaton are more difficult here, and what exactly is meant by 'a left orb'? Somewhat better is Duff, who understands *crinem* with *laeuum*, which he translates 'on the left side', but this would involve the assumption that Psecas is by contrast standing on the right, something for which there is no evidence in the text.

**497–501** The scene finds parallels on several monuments, including a famous relief from a tomb for an elderly married couple in the Landesmuseum Trier (Olson 2008: fig. 1.22), which shows a slave-woman dressing her mistress's hair while three assistants stand by. That such a scenario was commonplace is shown by the fact that the toilette relief is one of a number of scenes from everyday life depicted on the various panels of this monument. But this perfectly innocuous and quotidian activity becomes in J.'s hands a sardonic parody of a male *consilium*, involving a large but unspecified number of attendees (497–9), in contrast to the modest numbers



seen in the Trier relief and elsewhere. The *consilium* in question might be either the senate or the *consilium principis*. The former at this period judged serious criminal cases (cf. 500–1 *tamquam famae discrimen agatur | aut animae*), moreover *sententia prima* 498 and *censere* 500 are technical terms of senatorial deliberations. Equally, however, *sententia* is employed by Plin. *Ep.* 4.22.3 of opinions solicited in the imperial *consilium* and J. uses *censere* (130) of a ‘recommendation’ in his extended spoof of an imperial *consilium*, *Sat.* 4. In any event, the *matrona* is depicted in the position of the Emperor presiding over one or the other.

**497 est in consilio:** the image derives from Sen. *Brev. vit.* 12.3 *dum de singulis capillis in consilium itur*, where Seneca protests against male fussiness and bad temper in matters of coiffure; an irascibility which J. opportunistically transfers to the *matrona*. **materna:** sc. *ancilla*. That she worked for the *materfamilias*’ mother might favour taking the parodied *consilium* as imperial, since some *amici principis* served under more than one emperor. **admotaque lanis:** her term of service as hairdresser having expired (*emerita*... *acu* 498), she has been ‘retired to the wool’, possibly as the *lanipendia* of 476: cf. Sen. *Ep.* 12.3 *quis est iste... decrepitus et merito ad ianuam admotus?*

**498 emerita... acu:** the *acus* was the hairdresser’s tool of trade (cf. *CIL* VI 9727, a tomb for an *ornatrix* featuring a comb and an *acus*), but mention of an *acus* directly after the account of the *domina*’s assault on her *ornatrix* conjures up genre-scenes in which bad-tempered mistresses use these to attack their hairdresser (cf. McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.14.17–18). Stephens 2008: 125 *et passim*, noting that *acus* has three different meanings, sees the singular *acu* here as significant: she takes it to signify, not ‘hairpin’, its most familiar sense, but ‘needle (for hairdressing)’, a single needle, but multiple stitches, being required, as she shows, to create the elaborate coiffure of 502–4. **emerita:** for the term used of an inanimate object cf. *Stat. Theb.* 12.638.

**498–9 sententia prima | huius erit:** if J. has in mind the senate (497–501n.), the retired *ornatrix* is being assimilated to the senior ex-consul, the first to be asked for his opinion after the consuls designate. If conversely the parody is of the *consilium principis*, then she is presumably (Watson 2007b: 391 n. 68) playing the rôle of the senior member of council. For the procedure in the senate see next n.; for that in the *consilium principis*, Crook 1955: 112, Millar 1977: 228–40.

**499 post... minores:** the detail would suit either senate or *consilium principis*. In the former, the order of the speeches was in the main determined

by rank and seniority (cf. *aetate*); in the latter age was important, but precedence was typically given to rank or *dignitas* (Parkin 2003: 118–24), to which *arte* might correspond.

**500–1 tamquam...|...animae** ‘as though a decision were being made [OLD s.v. *discrimen* 3b] on someone’s reputation or life itself’ (*discrimen* additionally puns on the sense ‘parting in the hair’: OLD 1b). This scenario best fits a senatorial context. The senate tried serious criminal cases, in which persons convicted suffered *infamia*, official ‘disgrace’, entailing forfeiture of certain legal and civic rights (Crook 1967: 83–5), as well as capital charges (*discrimen capitis* Tac. *Germ.* 12.1: cf. *discrimen...animae*).

**501 tanta...decoris:** a concluding *sententia* to sum up the thought of the preceding section. For this figure (*epiphonema*) see Oakley on Liv. 6.41.11. The expression could also be seen as a banalisation of such solemn formulations as *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* Virg. *Aen.* 1.33 (Nadeau *ad loc.*).

**502–4 tot...|...|...aliam:** refers to the so-called *toupet*-style, in which the hair was piled up above the forehead in multiple layers to a towering height, as in the famous Fonseca bust (Bartman 2001: 8–12 and fig. 6), a style which, though prominent in the Flavian era (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.113–14), may have persisted into the late Trajanic or early Hadrianic period (cf. Bartman 2000: 19, Watson 2007b: 392).

**502–3 tot...|...caput** ‘with so many tiers she weighs down her head [OLD s.v. *premo* 13], with so many additional [*adhuc*: OLD 8a] constructions she builds it high’ (*compages* = *res ex diuersis partibus compacta*, TLL III 1997.67–8). For the metaphor cf. Jer. *In Is.* 3.23 *quibus [acibus] ornatorum crinium compago retinetur*.

**503 Andromachen** ‘an Andromache’. The heroine was a byword for tallness (Ov. *Ars* 3.777–8 with Gibson).

**503–4 a fronte...|...est:** cf. 495–6, 502–4nn.

**504 credas aliam:** according to Naumachius Stob. 4.573.12–13, if a woman tricks herself out elaborately, a husband ‘seeing you changing your appearance from one to another and then becoming different again [will think you] a single wife with multiple shapes’. **cedo si:** ‘what about it if?’: cf. Juv. 13.210 (*cedo* = *dic*). The markedly colloquial (Hofmann 1978: §41) term anticipates lexically the bathos of the Pygmy comparison after the quasi-heroic allusion of 503.

**504–5 si...|...lateris spatium:** i.e. ‘if she is naturally short’. For *sortior* cf. Sen. *Ep.* 58.30 *Plato...erat...corpus ualidum ac forte sortitus*. Lack of height is often mentioned as a defect in a woman (Sapph. fr. 49.2 L–P, Philodem.

*Epigr.* 17.1 Sider, *Lucr.* 4.1162, *Ov. Rem. am.* 321): the admired opposite was Corinna's *quantum et quale latus* (*Ov. Am.* 1.5.22).

**505–6 breuiorque ... | ... Pygmaea:** cf. *Priap.* 46.3 [*puella*] *Pygmaeo breuior gruem timenti. uirgine*, suggesting that full growth has not yet been attained, makes the comparison still more risible. Pygmies (known already to Homer, *Il.* 3.3–6) were intrinsically amusing to the Romans (*Juv.* 13.167–73, Cèbe 1966: 345–54). *breuis* is the *mot juste* for lack of height (*Hor. Sat.* 1.2.93, *Ov. Ars* 3.264).

**506 nullis adiuta coturnis** 'if unassisted by built-up boots'. *coturni* are properly platform boots, with as many as five layers of soles (Morrow 1985: 122, 131, 148), worn by actors in tragedies in order to enhance their height (cf. Olson 2008: fig. 1.26). Ischomachus' wife wore built-up shoes (*Xen. Oec.* 10.2), and the present passage has been taken as evidence that Roman women might be similarly shod (Olson 2008: 56, Morrow 180). But it is equally possible that the *matrona* is wearing an ox-hide sandal of the type known as *taurinae bisoles* (cf. Watson 2007b: 393), which would increase her height, but only slightly, and that J. sarcastically uses the term *coturni* for the sake of comic incongruity. On either explanation, J. is exploiting to the *matrona*'s disfavour the morally disreputable associations of the stage and the prostitute's practice, known from Alexis, fr. 103.7–8 K–A, of stitching cork into slippers in order to disguise shortness of stature.

**507** She is so short that she has to stand on tiptoe (ὀρθοποτυγῖαν) to receive a kiss. **leuis** 'lightly'.

**508–47** *She shows no concern for her husband or the ruinous expenses which she runs up. She is more like a neighbour than wife, except that, as wife, she can do more damage. She gives house room to the priests of Bellona and Cybele, who play upon her superstitiousness. She does punishing penances or, at Isis' command, fetches holy water from Egypt. Especial honour is reserved for Osiris and his priests, and costly reparation exacted for ritual violations. Next consulted is a palsied Jewess.*

The opening lines address a theme already treated several times in *Sat.* 6 (352–65, 466nn.), women's disastrously expensive, irresponsibly spendthrift ways. But its primary concern is superstition, a vice particularly associated as here with oriental religions (Koets 1929: 32–3) – and one to which the female sex was thought especially prone: cf. *Men.* fr. 878 K–A, *Strab.* 297 'everyone thinks that women are the originators of superstition', *Plut. Caes.* 63.7 'womanly weakness expressed in superstition', [Lucian] *Amores* 42, *Plaut. Mil.* 692–4, *Cic. Tusc.* 3.72 *superstitio muliebris quaedam*, *Nat. D.* 2.70. Writings on marriage took up the theme in a cautionary way. Antipater, *On marriage* counselled that a husband should

‘implant in his wife good opinions about the gods and piety *and superstition*’ (3.256 von Arnim), ‘Periktione the Pythagorean’ that ‘the harmonious woman’ should hate κενὴ δόξα, code for ‘empty superstition’ (Stob. 4.688). Of especial note is Plutarch, *Prae. coniug.* 140d ‘it is proper for a wife to worship and to recognise only the gods in whom her husband believes and for the door to be shut to strange cults and foreign superstitions’ – precisely what does not happen here, with the incursion into the household (511–16) of a band of *Galli*, followed by other religious charlatans. These call to mind the various types of bogus seer condemned at Cic. *Div.* 1.132, *non habeo denique nauci Marsum augurem, non uicanos haruspices, non de circo astrologos, non Isiacos coniectores, non interpretes somniorum*, a passage which undoubtedly influenced J., since all but the ‘Marsian augur’ resurface in 508–91.

The introduction at 511 of the first in a series of representatives of outlandish creeds and beliefs, and hence of the major theme of 508–68, is abrupt. Yet that there is an implicit connection with the preceding topic of extravagance (508–11) is suggested by Strabo, who prefaces his quotation of Men. fr. 878 K–A on female superstitiousness with the lemma ‘[Menander] says this when he brings on a [married] *person who is annoyed by the expenses incurred by the women on sacrifices*’. It is therefore of relevance that, in 511–47, J. highlights the costs incurred by the *matrona*’s superstitiousness (518–21, 537, 540–1, 546–7).

**508–9 nulla uiri cura ... | ... uiuit tamquam uicina mariti:** the kind of emotional and spatial alienation against which theorists of marriage counselled. Muson. 13A states that in a marriage ‘there should absolutely be a living together ... and a concern on the part of the husband and wife for each other’, but in an unsuccessful union ‘each party *looks only to his own interests, caring not for the other’s or, even worse, one party is so minded and lives in the same house but fixes his thought outside*’, essentially what the woman here, more neighbour than wife, does. Cf. also Themistius, *On the soul* (Stob. 4.530 περὶ γάμου) and Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 142f.

**508 interea:** amidst all her other concerns.

**509 damnorum:** the losses to which the wife’s extravagance subject her husband: cf. *grauis est rationibus* 511. **tamquam uicina mariti:** significantly, according to Cic. *Fin.* 5.65, ties with neighbours (*uicinitates*) rank a poor fourth in terms of closeness after family relationships.

**510–11 quod amicos coniugis odit | et seruos:** according to Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 140c ‘a wife should not have friends of her own, but use her husband’s as their common stock’: cf. ‘Periktione the Pythagorean’ for similar sentiments (Stob. 4.693). Conversely, Periktione states (ibid. 692), a wife who does not love her husband ‘is like an enemy ... and hates all who

please him'; precisely what the estranged *uxor* does here. For a historical instance of wifely hostility to her husband allied to hatred of his slave, cf. Cic. *Att.* 5.1.3–4.

**511 rationibus** 'his accounts' i.e. finances.

**511–12 ecce furentis | Bellonae matrisque deum chorus intrat:** just the sort of thing that 'Phintys the Pythagorean', *On womanly modesty* cautions against: '[wives] should refrain from orgiastic rituals and rites of the Great Mother that take place in house' (Stob. 4.593; cf. 590). Cf. also Plut. *Prae. coniug.* 140d (508–47n.). *ecce furentis... intrat* ironically echoes Virg. *Aen.* 8.228 *ecce furens animis aderat Tirynthius*, *ecce* highlighting the suddenness with which the band of *fanatici* bursts in: see Dionisotti 2007. **furentis | Bellonae matrisque deum chorus:** a troupe of followers of the Cappadocian goddess Ma (who became identified with the Italian war-goddess Bellona) and of the Great Mother Cybele. The devotees of these two Asiatic orgiastic goddesses are often mentioned in the same breath (cf. Luc. 1.565–7, Val. Flacc. 7.635–6), reflecting the close connection between the two cults (Fishwick 1967: 145, 152–4). *furentis* is a transferred epithet, reflecting the frenzy into which Ma-Bellona's worshippers worked themselves (cf. Juv. 4.123–4, Wissowa, *RK* 348–51). But it should be added that Bellona was sometimes portrayed as a Fury (Fishwick 1967: 155), a term connected with *furere*, and that deities may partake of the characteristics which they inspire (cf. Goodenough 1958: 112).

**512 chorus:** for *chorus* of a 'troupe' of *Galli* or the like cf. Sil. 17.20, Apul. *Met.* 8.26 *sed illae puellae chorus erat cinaedorum*. *chorus* cannot refer to the chants with which Cybele's followers, *Galli*, celebrated their cult-hero Attis and Cybele (cf. Graillot 1912: 301–2): the devotees of Bellona, who form part of the *chorus*, did not, it appears, engage in singing.

**512–13 ingens | semiuir:** cf. Arist. [*Pr.*] 10.36 (eunuchs grow larger), Pers. 5.186 *grandes Galli*. Persons castrated prior to puberty grow taller than they would otherwise do: see Dorfman and Shipley 1956: 315 for a physiologically-based explanation (also 316 fig. 5 illustrating such distortion in growth). The *ingens semiuir* is better regarded as the leader of a band of itinerant *Galli* (μητραγῦρται), more like the *dux* of the peripatetic eunuch-priests of the Dea Syria at Apul. *Met.* 8.26, than a so-called *archigallus*, leader of the college of *Galli*. While the title may go as far back as 450 BC, the formal establishment of the office of *archigallus* apparently dates to the late second century AD: cf. Graillot 1912: 230–1, Carcopino 1942: 76–102, Sanders 1972: 1008–14.

**513 semiuir:** for *semiuir* of *Galli* cf. Sil. 17.20, Min. Fel. *Oct.* 23.4, *Anth. Pal.* 6.217.9 (ἡμιγύναιξ), Sanders 1972: 1024. **obsceno facies reuerenda**

**minori** 'a figure to be revered by the lower-status perverts' (collective singular). For *facies* in this sense cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.448 with Horsfall. Cybele's cult was hierarchical (note *plebeia* 516; Parsons 1971: 61-2). For *obscenus* of sexual inversion see O1-2n.; in reference specifically to eunuchs, Val. Max. 7.7.6.

**514-15 mollia... | iam pridem:** the *Galli* practised ritual self-castration for reasons variously explained (Nock 1972: 7-15, Sanders 1972: 1006-7). The modes of emasculation were a sharp stone, a knife or, as here, a pot-herd: cf. Mart. 3.81.3, Plin. *HN* 35.165 *Samia testa matris deum sacerdotes, qui Galli uocantur, uirilitem amputant*], Vermaseren 1977: 96. *rapta* suggests the impulsive nature of the gesture, undertaken in a state of heightened religious ecstasy (Catull. 63.4-5, Ov. *Ib.* 453-4). The Romans felt nothing but contempt for the *Galli*, as for eunuchs in general (Vermaseren 1977: 96, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 9.13-14). That contempt comes through strongly in 511-16.

**514 mollia:** *mollis* often characterises the effeminised state of the *Galli* following castration (Ov. *Fast.* 4.243-4 *mollesque ministri | caedunt iactatis uilia membra comis*, Sen. *Ag.* 686, Mart. 5.41.2, Sanders 1972: 1024). *mollia* is best regarded as a transferred epithet used proleptically: 'he cut off his genitals, thereby making himself effeminate': for the adjective applied to eunuchs see 366-7n.

**515 iam pridem:** connecting the words with *ingens* 512, and noting that such preternatural height is contingent upon early castration, Richard 1966: 62-4 takes the phrase literally to mean 'as early as his youth, before even puberty'. But J.'s primary point is probably that, as a *Gallus* of long standing, he is far gone in the vices imputed to these (Suet. *Aug.* 68, Justin, *Apol.* 1.27, Graillot 1912: 317-18, Maass 1925: 432-6, Carcopino 1942: 84-6). Cael. Aurel. *Chron.* 4.137 states that, in the case of *cinaedi* (a related category to eunuchs: cf. Juv. 2.115-16), their perverted lust only grows stronger with age. *rauca* 'hoarse' or 'harsh-sounding' with the cries and shrieks which punctuated the devotions of the *Galli* (Graillot 1912: 301-2). Apul. *Met.* 8.26 *fracta et rauca et effeminata uoce clamores absonos intollunt*, on the Dea Syria's emasculated priests, suggests that *raucus* also characterises something intrinsic to the quality of the castrates' voices. The adjective is commoner of the instruments which the *Galli* sounded during their devotions (Lucr. 2.619, Ov. *Ib.* 456, Sen. *Ag.* 689-90). **tympana** 'kettledrums', one of the noisy instruments that accompanied the worship of Cybele (Eur. *Bacch.* 59, Lucian, *Dial. D.* 20.1 'another thunders on the drum or bangs cymbals', Varro, *Sat. Men.* 132 Astbury *tibi tympanon inanes sonitus matris deum | tonimus*). The *tympanum* has an association with

Eastern effeminacy (Dickie 1985: 175), relevant here. **cedunt**: he outshrieks (*gallare* Varro, *Sat. Men.* 119 Astbury) the voices and the drums of his lower-ranking (*plebeia*) followers. For *cedere* of drowning out others cf. 438.

**516 plebeia** has a technical colour. The ordinary members of a religious college might be called *plebs* (Calza 1947: 200 no. 3). **Phrygia... tiara**: the *tiara* is a Phrygian conical cap (*pilleus*, πῖλος) with flaps hanging down over the cheeks (*uestitur bucca* Schol.) worn by the *Galli*. In Latin sources there is considerable terminological confusion with the *mitra*, also worn by *Galli*, which is properly a long strip of cloth wound round the head like a turban: cf. Brandenburg 1966: 61–4, Pease on Virg. *Aen.* 4.216. The low-style, often depreciatory *bucca* enhances the sneering tone of 515–16 (Urech 1999: 136–8). **uestitur**: present tense because the result of the action performed earlier, donning the tiara, continues into the present: cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.120 *obducuntur libro aut cortice trunci*, K–S 1.118.

**517 grande sonat** μεγαλοφωνεῖ, ‘makes loud utterance’. The volume is designed to enhance the impressiveness of the message (undercut, however, by the triteness of what follows). For the tactic cf. Lucian, *Menipp.* 9 ‘the *magus*... no longer spoke in gentle tones but shouted out quite as loudly as he could’.

**517–18 metuique... et austri | aduentum**: the *Galli* were known for their prophesying (Diod. Sic. 36.13, Liv. 38.18.9 *uaticinantes fanatico carmine*, *CIL* VIII 8203), towards which women supposedly exhibited particular credulity (Plut. *De Pyth. or.* 407c). The utter banality of the prognostication creates bathos: everyone knew that autumn was an unhealthy season in Rome; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.18–19 *plumbeus Auster | autumnusque grauis, Libitinae quaestus acerbae*, *Carm.* 2.14.15–16 with N–H, Juv. 4.56–7. The culprit was malaria, the picture dominated by *P. falciparum*, the most dangerous form of the disease (Sallares 2002: 50–2, 201–34).

**518 nisi... ouis**: since eggs contain life *in nucleo* and could accordingly be thought of as bringers of fertility and good luck (Nilsson 1951: 18–20), a purificatory function was by extension ascribed to them, and they were used in lustratory rituals (Ov. *Ar.* 2.330, Mart. 7.54.7, Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 1.1, *PGM* 7.522); the idea was that the eggs would absorb by transference the illness or impurity being conjured away (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 7.26.2–3). Like J., Augustine and Clement (ibid.) protest against the lustratory use of eggs by charlatans (Dölger 1940, who also notes (59) that the priest will eat the eggs). **centum... ouis** a hecategg (ἑκῶν ἑκατόμβη Ehippus, fr. 8.4 K–A).

**519 et xerampelinas...donauerit ipsi:** *xerampelinae* (sc. *uestes*) are garments coloured like withered vine leaves (Gk. *xeros*, ‘dry’, *ampelos*, ‘grape-vine’), which the *Suda* (1.406 Adler) equate with Ἀτραβατικὰς [ἐσθῆτας], so named for their *ater*, ‘dark’ hue. By requiring that the *matrona* give him her exotically-coloured cast-offs – like the eggs, clearly for his own use rather than expiatory purposes, as he claims (520–1) – the *Gallus* exposes both his effeminacy and his venality. *Galli* typically wore female clothing (Varro, *Sat. Men.* 120 Astbury *uenusta muliebri ornati stola*, *Anth. Pal.* 6.219.3, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.19.5). The implication that soothsayers are venal goes back at least to Sophocles (*Ant.* 1055 and *OT* 387–9, where Oedipus styles Tiresias an ἀγύρτης, a mercenary begging priest).

**520–1** ‘so that any sudden and great danger which threatens may pass into the garments and he [or possibly “she”] may [thereby] avert the disasters of [*OLD expio* 4] the whole year in one go [*OLD semel* 5]’. For the idea that some other entity might serve as an expiatory receptacle for prospective misfortunes, cf. Sen. *Helv.* 18.6 *quidquid matri dolendum fuit, in me transierit...fuerim tantum nihil amplius doliturae domus piammentum*. The notion that illnesses actual and threatened (*instat*) can be conjured away by magical transference is a familiar one (*RE* I 35–6 s.v. *Aberglaube*, Versnel 1976: 389–93): so too the specification that such perils will be banished for a year (e.g. Plin. *HN* 23.110, 27.105, Celsus, *Med.* 4.7.4, Marcell. *Empir.* 28.45). But the idea of (donated) clothing as the expiatory vessel seems unparalleled (diseases are usually transferred into animals, plants and minerals: Stempler 1925: 62–77), painting the *Gallus* as a charlatan on the make.

**522–4 hibernum fracta...|...|...caput abluet:** by immersing herself in the Tiber she seeks to wash away an (unspecified) pollution: flowing water was a purificatory agent *par excellence* (Eitrem 1915: 76–132). Its coldness enhances its cathartic qualities, Eitrem 83 postulates, noting also that ice-cold baths were prescribed by the priests of Isis as a punishment for sins. For such purificatory immersion cf. Plut. *De superst.* 166a, Apul. *Met.* 11.1; in the Tiber specifically, Pers. 2.15–16 *Tiberino in gurgite mergis | mane caput. bis terque et noctem flumine purgas*, also Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.288–95, where, ‘demented with superstition’, a mother lethally stations her child in the freezing Tiber. The extreme nature of the ritual bath calls to mind the ‘barbarous and outlandish penances and mortifications’ to which, Plutarch complains (*De superst.* 171b), the superstitious submit themselves.

**522 fracta glacie:** J. treats the freezing of the Tiber as a routine occurrence when it was quite exceptional (W–W 330).

**523 ter...mergetur:** three is a ritually important number (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 5.53–4). For triple lustration by water cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.189–90, *Fast.*



4.315. **matutino** = *mane*. For such ritual ablutions in early morning see 522-4n.

**524 uerticibus** 'eddies', i.e. she plunges right into the river, instead of merely dipping in her head at its edge. **timidum caput abluet**: *timidum* glosses δεισιδαιμονία, an (irrational) 'fear of the gods'. For purificatory immersion of the head cf. Theophr. *Char.* 16.14, Pers. 2.15-16 (522-4n.), Dittenberg. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1042.4. The head, as one of the body parts most exposed to the outside world, was particularly liable to evil influences and so especially in need of purification (Eitrem 1915: 88-91).

**524-6 inde ... | ... | erepet genibus**: crawling on one's knees was a sign of religious submission (Tib. 1.2.85 with Smith): also a gesture of self-mortification (Sen. *Vit. beat.* 26.8) with, as the Senecan context shows, Isiac associations, relevant to 522-6. Cf. Tinh 1971: 85-6 with fig. 41, an Isiac ceremony featuring two figures on their knees, of whom one, clearly female, may be crawling forward. Falling on one's knees was associated particularly with women (Polyb. 32.15.7 'going down on his knees and behaving like a woman', Sen. *Vit. beat.* 26.8 (reading *aliqua*), Mitropoulou 1975).

**524 inde** 'from there'. The Tiber and the Campus Martius (next n.) were in close proximity (*LTUR* I 220).

**524-5 superbi | ... regis agrum**: making for the temple of Isis in the Campus Martius, which, according to the dominant of two traditions, had been dedicated to Mars after the expulsion of Tarquin the Proud, who once occupied it (Platner-Ashby 92). The sanctuary, destroyed by fire in AD 80, was rebuilt by Domitian. Excavations at the site have revealed numerous Egyptian monuments or monuments with an Egyptianising character (*LTUR* s.v. 'Campus Martius' and 'Iseum et Serapeum in Campo Martio').

**525 totum**: an exaggeration. The grassy area of the Campus Martius was getting smaller and smaller thanks to encroachment by buildings (*LTUR* I 224). **nuda** combines sacral nudity (Heckenbach 1911: 1-7, 12-13) with a further gesture of submission (cf. Plut. *Comp. Cim. et Lucull.* 3.4). *nuda* could mean partially or totally unclad (in some artistic representations of female worshippers on their knees, these are naked: Mitropoulou 1975: 21, 39, 53). But, in either event, for the *matrona* to go *nuda* in public is an affront to Roman *mores* (Kaster 2005: 23). Superstition, however, overrides modesty. **tremibunda**: from superstitious fear (δεισιδαιμονία) and cold.

**525-6 cruentis | ... genibus**: another shocking detail, gaining in effect from the unpleasant associations of *cruentus* (Mencacci 1986). Devotees

similarly approaching the shrine of Fatima in Portugal are sensibly armed with protective knee-pads.

**526 si candida iusserit Io:** Isis became identified with the cow-headed divinity Hathor, which in turn encouraged conflation with the mythical Io, who was turned temporarily into a white (*candida*: cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.652) cow and fetched up in Egypt (Gwyn Griffiths on Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 365f). Courtney raises an important issue of punctuation here. Noting that the details in 522–6 suggest the worship of Isis, he connects *si...Io* with *hibernum...genibus* 522–6 and punctuates 526 with a comma after *genibus* and a semi-colon after *Io*. But it seems better to infer the Isiac colour of 522–6 from the context and, with Clausen, to join *si...Io* with what follows, thereby providing a rationale for the excessive and ritually superfluous (foll. n.) actions of 527–9.

**526–9** In her superstitiousness she goes all the way to Meroe in the Upper Nile, to fetch Nile-water, which was holy (Dölger 1936: 153–6), for sprinkling in Isis' temple in Rome. This despite the fact that *sciendum in sacris simulata pro ueris accipi*, so that *in templo Isidis [Romano] aqua sparsa de Nilo esse dicebatur* (Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 2.116), and that it was also possible to procure genuine Nile-water, bottled for export (Epiph. *Adv. haeres.* 51.30), obviating the need for travel. *CIL* III 83, from just beyond Meroe, may provide evidence for an Isiac pilgrimage similar to the *matrona*'s, but the details are contentious: see Shinnie 1961 and Hintze 1964.

**527–8 ad Aegypti finem...| a Meroe:** Meroe, an island formed by branches of the Nile and containing a homonymous city, was part of ancient Ethiopia, located 'nearly 900 miles south of Syene...the southern limit of the Roman empire' Duff. Excavations in ancient Meroe have uncovered two superimposed temples. Two figurines of Isis found there have led to the conclusion that the lower one was a shrine of the goddess, who was worshipped by the Ethiopians. Cf. Snowden Jnr. 1956, Shinnie 1967: 84, Witt 1971: 60–1.

**528 ut spargat:** water, of great importance in the Isis cult (Witt 1971: 89–92), was employed for lustratory purposes in the worship of the goddess (Wild: 1981) and is used here to purify the temple (or the temple and statuary): cf. Serv. quoted 526–9n., Tac. *Ann.* 15.44, Tert. *De bapt.* 5 *ad init.*, Eitrem 1915: 126–32, Dölger 1936: 164.

**529 antiquo...ouili:** the structure in the Campus Martius usually known as the *Saepta*, where the *centuriae* cast their votes, but sometimes referred to by its earlier name (Liv. 26.22.11) of *ouile*, from the resemblance of its marked-out pens to a sheepfold (Serv. Virg. *Ecl.* 1.33). J. employs the latter term to imply that Isis' temple is an unwelcome intruder in Rome's ancestral heartland: cf. Juv. 3.15–16 for a similar idea.

**530 ipsius:** cf. Paus. 10.32.13 'whomever Isis in person (αὐτή), singling them out for honour, invites [into her temple] in dreams'. In her superstitious credulity (*credit*) the *matrona* believes herself one such. **dominae:** an honorific epithet of Isis (Vidman 1969: 510, 588, 754), equivalent to her Greek cult-title κυρία (Vidman 332, 334, 491). Both *dominae* and the likewise technical *moneri* argue against Paldamus' deletion of 530, favoured by Nisbet 1995: 283. **moneri:** 'constantly used of divine instructions which come through dreams' Gwyn Griffiths on Apul. *Met.* 11.6 *init.*

**531** 'A likely sort of soul and intellect for the gods to converse with by night!' Duff. *en* with accusative is sarcastic, as at Juv. 2.72. The sarcasm is prompted both by her foolish superstitiousness (*mentem*) and ethical unworthiness (cf. *animam*) as a bad wife. Isis kept watch over an individual's moral life (Isidorus, *Hymn* 3.26-8 with Vanderlip 1972 *ad loc.*) and demanded *innocentia* of her votaries (Apul. *Met.* 11.16 with Gwyn Griffiths). **cum qua di nocte loquantur!** Isis often communicated with mortals in dreams (Roussel 1915-16: 269). Commentators assume that J. is referring to incubation (sleeping in a temple in the expectation of a dream-vision from the incumbent deity), which was certainly part of Isiac usage (Gwyn Griffiths on Apul. *Met.* 11.5, p. 139). But there is no mention of incubation in the text and Isis could equally appear unsolicited in a dream: cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.686-701, Lib. 11.114. On either scenario, the *matrona* is superstitious enough to believe that she enjoys privileged communication with the gods. For the overall idea behind 527-31 cf. Macrob. *In somn.* 1.3.8 *et est oraculum quidem, cum in somnis... seu sacerdos uel etiam deus quid... faciendum uitandumque denuntiat.*

**532-4** Given her devotion to the goddess (*ergo*), she pays especial honour to the priest of Isis, who, wearing a mask of the jackal-headed god Anubis, leads the ritual lament for her consort Osiris: Anubis was closely associated with the divine pair (Vidman 1969: 257. 3-4, Witt 1971: 17, 31, 198-209, Heyob 1975: 106, *LIMC* 1872). For her priests thus garbed heading Isiac processions cf. Apul. *Met.* 11.11, Diod. Sic. 1.87.3, App. *B. Civ.* 4.47, Dölger 1936: 159, Grenier 1977: 72-3, 178-9, pl. 36.

**532 praecipuum suumumque...honorem:** by comparison with the priests of other cults.

**533 grege linigero circumdatus et...caluo:** Isiac initiates wore garments of linen, *purissimum...rebus diuinis uelamentum* (Apul. *Apol.* 56), and shaved their heads, likewise for reasons of ritual cleanliness (Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 352d-e). Cf. Mart. 12.28.19 *linigero fugiunt calui sistrataque turba*, Tinh 1964: pls. iv-v and pp. 13-17 for representations of Isiac ritual and functionaries in which all the priests are bald, with the exception of the one

who wears an Anubis mask. The contemptuous *grex* (161 n.) shows what J. thinks of the worshippers.

**534 plangentis** ‘mourning’, in reference to the ritual lament for the death of Osiris, forming part of the Roman worship of Isis (Heyob 1975: 54–7), but with a suggestion also of the verb’s literal sense of ‘beating the breast’, which accompanied the annual lament (Min. Fel. *Oct.* 23.1). **currit**: a seemingly unique detail: Anubis in iconography is normally represented as static (though a representation on a medallion from Orange of an Isiac procession led by Anubis does give an impression of lively movement: cf. Grenier 1977: pl. 36). **derisor**: mocking the credulity of the people for believing what the priest knows to be a religious sham, and negating *plangentis*. The idea was no doubt suggested by the resemblance of the Anubis mask to the mouth of a dog tired from running, its teeth bared in the semblance of a grin.

**535–8** The priest intercedes for her whenever she has violated ritual purity by having sex at a time when abstinence was required (*sacris observandisque diebus*). The Isis cult imposed short periods of chastity (Prop. 2.33.1–6, Witt 1971: 143–4) and in general set a high value on sexual continence (Heyob 1975: 119–27).

**535 ueniam**: properly a pontifical term (Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 1.519), *uenia* signifies divine indulgence for some fault or neglect (Schilling 1982: 39–42).

**535–6 quotiens non abstinet... | concubitu**: she makes a habit of breaking the periodic taboo on sexual intercourse (for an instance cf. Ov. *Pont.* 1.1.51–2). For the expression cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 351f, the cult curtails licentiousness ἀφροδισίων ἀποχᾶς, ‘by abstention from sex’.

**537 uiolato**: *uiolare*, a word with markedly sexual overtones, is often used as here of a religious desecration (Gaertner on Ov. *Pont.* 1.1.51). **cadurco**: a rare word for mattress, found in some sexually-charged lines of Sulpicia preserved in a scholion to 537 and named after the Gallic tribe of the Cadurci who made these (Plin. *HN* 19.13).

**538** Cf. Ael. *NA* 10.31 ‘they say that the asp to which the Egyptians have attached the name *Thermouthis* is sacred, and those who live there worship it and they bind the statues of Isis with it, as though with some royal diadem’. Griffiths 1961: 114 explores the close association of Isis with the snake. **mouisse caput... argentea serpens**: moving the head was a recognised sign of divine anger (Virg. *Aen.* 7.292 with Horsfall, Sittl 1890: 82 n. 10) and the spontaneous movement of a statue – no doubt a fiction of the priest playing upon the *uxor*’s feelings of guilt and gullibility – highly portentous (Jul. Obseq. 48, SHA *Comm.* 16, Wülker 1903: 19, Muecke 1984: 107).

**539 meditataque** 'practised', past participle of deponent *meditor* used passively. Like the tears, the intercessionary *murmura* are a profitable (540-1) routine. **murmura**: in Antiquity one normally prayed aloud (Sudhaus 1906). Murmured or unvoiced prayers are associated with superstitious practice and religious charlatanry: cf. Pers. 5.184, Lucian, *Nekyomant.* 7 'murmuring (ὑποτονθορύσας) that incantation', Schmidt 1907: 59, 62.

**540 culpa**: both a sexual misdemeanour and a sacrilege, as at Ov. *Met.* 10.553 and Tac. *Ann.* 3.24. For *culpa* as code for the former cf. Wilhelm-Hooijbergh 1954: 49-53, Moles 1984: 51-3. **ansere**: the goose was sacred to various deities, Isis and Osiris included (Toynbee 1973: 263, *RE* VII 722), and (there being effectively no prohibition on sacrificing to gods a creature sacred to them, Stengel 1910: 197-202) was a common offering to Isis: cf. *Anth. Pal.* 6.231.3-4 (goose and cake, as here), Ael. Aristid. 25 (1.500.10-11 Dind.), Ov. *Fast.* 1.453-4.

**541 scilicet...corruptus** 'provided, of course, he is bribed', sneering at the priest for imputing to Osiris a venality equivalent to his own. **tenui popano**: plainest of the various types of sacrificial cake which were an adjunct to the main (animal) offering and might fulfil a propitiatory purpose, as here (Stengel 1910: 71). For *popana* offered to Isis cf. Heliod. *Aeth.* 7.1.1-2, *Anth. Pal.* 6.231.3 (where the qualifier λαγάρων apparently means 'thin, narrow in section', like *tenue*). Like the goose (cf. Hdt. 2.37), the cake will be eaten by the priest (cf. Ar. *Plut.* 660-81 for similar culinary opportunism). See further Kearns 1994, Friedländer *ad loc.*

**542 cum dedit ille locum** 'once he has cleared off'. **cophino fenoque**: apparently a hay-basket (hendiadys) for keeping food warm on the Sabbath, when the use of fire was forbidden. Duff's objection (*ad Juv.* 3.14) to this explanation, that since the Jews were beggars (*mendicat* 543), they might be satisfied with a cold meal once a week, is misconceived. A passage of the Babylonian Talmud prescribes which substances may or may not be used for depositing hot vessels in; the former include straw (Cameron 1926): and Jews reserved for the Sabbath the most elegant meal of the week (Goldenberg 1979: 435). See further Courtney on 3.14.

**543 arcanam...mendicat in aurem** 'comes begging into her private ear', suggesting an undesirable degree of intimacy between the *matrona* and the Jewess, who receives payment for her interpretative skills. The begging Jew is a well-established satirical type: cf. *Juv.* 3.12-16, *Mart.* 12.57.13 with W-W, who note that, while the Jewish population of Rome was not affluent, the stereotype is distinctly reductive. **Iudaea tremens** 'a palsied Jewess', sneering at the meanness of the person in whom the *matrona* puts her trust.

**544–5** J.'s point is the woman's fascination with the secret lore to which the Jews were supposedly privy – a further instance of her obsession with bizarre foreign religions – whence the mock-honorific titles *interpres legum Solymarum* etc. There is considerable evidence for upper-class Roman women flirting with Judaism: cf. Williams 1988 and 1998: 163–75.

**544** *interpres legum Solymarum*: Jews were known for the strictness with which they observed their laws, which went back to Moses (Mayor on Juv. 14.101, Williams 1988: 108 n. 63). Joseph. *AJ* 18.81–2 describes a Jewish charlatan who, claiming to be able to expound (ἐξηγεῖσθαι) the laws of Moses, succeeded thereby in cheating a Roman noblewoman who was an adherent of Judaism. *Hierosolyma*, often shortened to *Solyma*, is a transliteration of the Semitic name for Jerusalem, whence the ethnic adjective *Solymus*, 'Jewish'. Cf. Feldman 1993: 190–6.

**544–5** *magna sacerdos* | *arboris*: *arboris* probably (Wiesen 1980) refers to the menorah, the seven-branched candlestick, which in some representations could look very much like a tree (Leon 1995: 196), appears to have its origins in the so-called 'tree of life' (Yarden 1971: 35–40) and was certainly familiar to the Romans, featuring on the Arch of Titus (Yarden 1971: 6–9, illustr. 4). The most popular interpretation, that J. is referring to the trees in the grove of Egeria, where Jewish beggars had their abode (*Sat.* 3.12–16: cf. 16 *arbor, silua*), is unlikely. The other allusions in 544–5 are to the Jewish religion and belief system and are mock-elevated: an allusion to something as trivial as their woody encampment is quite out of place. For various other suggestions see Courtney, Herrmann 1940: 448–9, Stern 1980: 101, Wiesen 1980: 14–15.

**544** *sacerdos*: 'since female officiants are alien to authentic Judaism, the term *magna sacerdos* mocks (with a probable allusion to the High Priest of the Temple cult) the lofty religious authority which the seeress wants to assume in the eyes of a credulous pagan' Wiesen 1980: 14.

**545** *summi fida internuntia caeli*: as Yahweh is a god of the sky, the idea came about that, for the Jews, the two were one and the same: cf. Juv. 14.97 *nil praeter nubes et caeli numen adorant* with Mayor. The phrase again foregrounds the *matrona*'s superstitious belief that Jews are possessed of an arcane knowledge which she can access.

**546** *et illa* 'she too' (in addition to the priest of Isis).

**546–7** *aere minuto* | ... *somnia uendunt*: both *qualiacumque uoles* (they tell their clients what they want to hear) and *aere minuto* establish that J. shares the low opinion of dream-analysts which prevailed in certain quarters (Cic. *Div.* 1.132 (508–47n.), Artem. 1 *prooem.*, Lucian, *Somn.* 17). It is a defining characteristic of charlatans offering divinatory or magical expertise to

require only a small fee for their services (cf. Ennius (268 Jocelyn) ap. Cic. *Div.* 1.132 *quibus diuitias pollicentur, ab iis drachumam ipsi petunt*, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 17.60). For meagre fees paid out to dream-interpreters in particular cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 52–3, Dem. Phal. *FGrH* 228 F45a.

**547 Iudaei:** the Jew who fraudulently claims the ability to interpret dreams or prophecy is a common stereotype: cf. the Elymas of *Acts* 13, a sorcerer who posed as a prophet and formed an association with a prominent Roman, as the *Iudaea* does with the *matrona* here, Nock 1972: 324–6, Williams 1988: 105–6. The reputation of the Jews for dream-interpretation rested on the widespread practice of oneiromancy in the ancient Near East: cf. Just. *Epit.* 36.2.7–8 (the biblical Joseph supposedly invented the art), Noegel 2007: 113–23.

**548–91** *Amoral foreign soothsayers promise a lover or a legacy, but women have greater faith in astrologers, especially those whose art has nearly cost them their lives. These they consult about the deaths of various family members. Such women, however, don't have any astrological knowledge; the ones you really should avoid are those who can interpret for themselves the astrological tables and textbooks used by the experts, and won't engage in any activity until they have determined whether the time is favourable to do so. Plebeian women likewise make use of divination, but must resort to itinerant fortune-tellers of various sorts available at the Races. Rich women can afford to employ qualified specialists; the woman of humble station must consult some charlatan in the circus when she wants advice on her love-life.*

An attack on the addiction of *matronae* of all ranks to fortune-telling. Again J. skews the picture, portraying as a peculiarly female vice a practice which was frequent among the population as a whole, including politicians and emperors: see Rüpke 2007: 230. Neither is J. concerned with complete accuracy (cf. 551n. *catelli* and 579n.), choosing details in part for their satiric effect.

The composition of the final section (582–91) has attracted criticism, especially 585–7, which seem repetitive, as well as contrasting inelegantly with the lines preceding and following. As Courtney 1974: 15–17 demonstrated, however, the allusion to poor women (582–4) is elaborated further at 588–91, 585–7 – added purely for the sake of contrast – being an example of adversative asyndeton whereby a logically subordinate clause is juxtaposed paratactically to the main clause (588–91). As regards the structure of 548–91 as a whole, there is an effect of ring composition, the main preoccupations of the rich woman, a desirable young lover and a large inheritance (548–9), being contrasted with that of the poor woman, who will only exchange one humble husband for another (588–91). The descent from rich to poor results in a bathetic ending.

**548–52** Women make use of *haruspices* to obtain promises of what they value most – sex and money: cf. Lucian, *Alex.* 5, *Merc. cond.* 27. J. is speaking, not of the public *haruspices* who were part of Roman state religion (cf. 392n.), but of the private practitioners, of ill repute, by association with whom women are tainted. Not only are these shown resorting to child-murder and delation (552nn.), but their connection with foreign cults is exploited by J. when he portrays them as Easterners (550) and as using methods associated with oriental religions, or at least unusual in Roman religious practice (*calidae... columbae, pulmone* and *catelli* 549–51nn.): the implication being, as elsewhere, that the foreign and exotic exercises a corrupting influence on women. For *haruspices*, and the suspicion with which these were often viewed, see further Cato *Agr.* 5.4, Cic. *Div.* 1.131–2 with Pease, Columella, *Rust.* 1.8.6, Haack 2002: 112–13, Horster 2007: 336–8.

**548** *amatorem tenerum* ‘a toy-boy’ (Braund), a figure associated with the stereotype of the sex-crazed old woman (e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 975–9 (μειράκιον 975), *Ecccl.* 877–1111, Hor. *Epod.* 12 (*iuueni* 3)) – though no mention is made here of the *matrona*’s age, merely her adulterous intentions.

**548–9** *diuitis orbi* | *testamentum ingens*: a large legacy from a rich childless man (cf. 39–40n.) – perhaps wishful thinking, since there is little evidence for testators leaving the inheritance to *extranei*: in the event of childlessness such persons normally chose family members (Champlin 1991: 100–1). But the detail brands her a *captatrix*, thus attaching to her the moral disapprobation associated with *captatio* (cf. Champlin 1991: 96–102) and perhaps insinuating a further slur: services provided to the targets of captation standardly included the sexual.

**549–50** *calidae pulmone columbae* | *tractato*: the *haruspex* makes his prediction by extispicy, examining for ominous signs of abnormalities (cf. 392) the lungs of a newly killed dove, which is *calidae* because such examinations took place while the entrails were still warm (Bouché-Leclercq 1882: 67 n. 5).

**549** *calidae... columbae*: satiric alliteration; cf. *pectora pullorum* (551). In official Roman religion, sheep or bulls were the preferred victims. Though birds are sometimes mentioned (*pectora pullorum* n.), there are no parallels for the use of doves in divination (for Cyprus, cf. Ov. *Fast.* 1.451–2): given the promise in 548 of an *amator*, the *columba* is doubtless chosen for its association with Venus. For a likewise fanciful animal selected to suit the (sinister) context cf. Juv. 3.44–5 *ranarum uiscera numquam* | *inspexi*, on which Braund 1990: 504 appositely suggests that ‘*ranarum* is a satirical exaggeration of the kind of small animal used by the bogus practitioners of the art of divination’. **pulmone**: in Roman/Etruscan ritual the liver



was the most significant organ, though the lungs were sometimes examined: cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.85, 2.29 (*tauri opimi iecur aut cor aut pulmo*), Bouché-Leclercq 1882: 68-9, Bonfante 2006: 10-11. The lungs were, however, of great importance in *Babylonian* extispicy (Starr 1983: 38, 68-75).

**550 Armenius:** quite possibly = 'Persian': see Kroll on Catull. 90.2. **Commagenus:** from Commagene, in the northern part of Syria.

**551 pectora pullorum...exta catelli:** Cic. *Div.* 2.29 *sunt... qui uel argutissima haec exta esse dicant* and Plin. *HN* 10.49 attest the use of chickens in divination by the Romans, albeit Iambl. *VP* 28.147 views the employment of birds for such purposes as characteristic of *barbari*. The diminutive forms *pulli* and *catelli* create assonance and mock-pathos. **rimabitur:** cf. Apul. *Apol.* 41.3 *an hariolis licet iocinera rimari?* **catelli:** according to Paus. 6.2.4-5 the use of dogs for divination was a method peculiar to the Elean diviner Thrasybulus.

**552 interdum et pueri:** though no doubt satiric hyperbole, the accusation is not without some basis in reality; cf. Cic. *Vat.* 14 *cum puerorum extis deos manes mactare soleas*, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 5 pp.175-6. Under Domitian, Apollonius of Tyana was accused of murdering and dismembering an Arcadian boy for purposes of divination (Philostr. *VA* 8.7.35-9). **faciet quod deferat ipse:** he will commit a crime, the murder of a child for divinatory purposes, intending to turn informer himself (*quod deferat* is relative with subjunctive of purpose) and get his patroness into trouble: cf. Sen. *De ir.* 2.7.3 *alius delator uenit eius criminis cuius manifestior reus est. delatores* are often portrayed as traitors to their friends, e.g. Juv. 1.33, 3.116.

**553-6** Women have such faith in astrologers that they will rank their prophecies with those of the most venerable oracle. The hyperbole is designed to underscore the women's credulity in putting their trust in a charlatan, but the gap between astrology and oracles is by no means as wide as J. represents it: there was a link between the two at this period, the replies of the Delphic oracle being often couched in astrological terms (e.g. that a serious illness was due to the malign influence of Saturn), in order to take account of the growing interest in astrology: see Parke and Wormell 1956: 375-6. In a further distortion, J. depicts astrology as an upper-class woman's folly, whereas in fact it was a serious science (cf. on 560), popular among both sexes and all classes: cf. Cramer 1954: 253, Barton 1994: 157-78.

**553 Chaldaeis:** properly = Babylonians, but used by Roman writers of astrologers in general. It was debated whether astrology originated in Mesopotamia (where Babylon lay) or Egypt. Cf. Cramer 1954: 238, Barton 1994: 9.

**554–5 a fonte ... | Hammonis:** the oracle of Zeus Ammon in the oasis of Siwa, 500 km west of Cairo, where there was a famous ‘fountain of the sun’ (Hdt. 4.181, Sil. 3.669–72, Parke 1967: 194–241). Built by Greeks from Cyrene in the sixth century BC, it was rarely visited by the Augustan period (Strab. 813). Although it is often used simply to express the idea of an oracle (e.g. Ov. *Ars* 3.789, Stat. *Theb.* 8.201, Val. Max. 8.15.ext.3), the contrast with the extinct Delphic oracle (555) makes it clear that the ‘fountain of Ammon’ here stands for an oracle that was still in operation, as opposed to defunct (Parke 1967: 249).

**555 quoniam Delphis oracula cessant:** though the Delphic oracle continued to be consulted frequently by the Greeks on private, as opposed to state, matters (Plut. *De def. or.* 407d, 408c, Parke and Wormell 1956: 393), it had been neglected by the Romans since the time of Sulla, and interest was only revived under Hadrian (Parke and Wormell 1956: 283–91).

**556** ‘since ignorance of the future (*caligo* + gen. on the analogy of *ignorantia* + gen.) dooms the human race’; the more usual expression would be something like *genus humanum damnatur caligine futuri*.

**558–9** ‘By whose friendship and by whose venal [lit. ‘able to be hired’] horoscope a great citizen [i.e. Galba] died, one whom Otho [his successor] dreaded’ (Duff). The reference must be to an astrologer called Ptolemaeus (Tac. *Hist.* 1.22) or Seleucus (Suet. *Otho* 4, 6) whose predictions encouraged Otho’s aspirations to succeed Galba and his orchestration of Galba’s murder. But the lines, omitted by MSS PFG, though possibly Juvenalian on account of the typically paradoxical effect *cuius amicitia ... cuius obit*, do not belong here. They interrupt the connection between 557 and 560–64 by restricting attention to a specific astrologer, whereas the focus in the section as a whole is on practitioners of repute whose expertise was such as to threaten their lives. The fact that Ptolemaeus/Seleucus suffered exile (562–4n.) might have motivated the interpolation of 558–9 in a context dealing with the *exilium* of astrologers. Moreover, there are internal difficulties: (1) *cuius amicitia* implies an otherwise unattested friendship between Galba and Ptolemaeus/Seleucus; (2) in an awkward juxtaposition, *conducendaque tabella* must allude to the astrologer’s relationship with Otho (Duff explains ‘he had once been intimate with Galba and had transferred his allegiance to Otho for gain’, but this scenario is not backed up by other sources); (3) one might have expected Otho to be feared by Galba, not the other way round – unless the reference is to Otho’s pretended fear for his life to excuse his attack on Galba (Tac. *Hist.* 1.21).

**560 inde fides artis ... si** ‘their belief in his skill depends on whether’. Serious astrologers regarded their discipline as an *ars*, cf. Manil. 1.1, Tac. *Ann.* 6.22.3, Barton 1994: 7, 62. **sonuit si dextera ferro:** it was standard

practice under the Empire for imprisoned persons to be chained: *RE* III 2.1581.

**561:** rightly excised by Ribbeck, Willis and Braund. *laeuaque* is a flat supplementation of *dextra*, and *longe* (or *longo*, read by some) presents further difficulties. *castrorum in carcere* must allude to the barracks of the praetorian and urban cohorts used as a prison (see Courtney *ad loc.*; Duff on Juv. 3.314), but this was not ‘far off’, nor does it help to give *longe* a temporal sense, prisons being generally used as temporary holding facilities rather than for prolonged incarceration.

**562–4** Only an astrologer prominent enough to be banished to a remote island, barely escaping execution (*qui paene perit*), ‘will get credit for genius’ in the eyes of the world – and by extension in the *mulier*’s. Death or exile, the two capital penalties (*Dig.* 37.14.10), were the alternatives facing persons convicted of serious crimes: cf. Sen. *Cons. Polyb.* 13.2 (death sentence commuted to *deportatio in insulam*), Tac. *Ann.* 3.50, 4.28–30, 14.48–9. In the case of an astrologer, the crime would usually be *maiestas* (treason), since they were often consulted about when the emperor would die or when there would be a change of government. There are many instances of astrologers being banished, often *en masse* (see Cramer 1954: 233–48, Barton 1994: 50), but presumably J. is thinking of prominent individuals such as the Egyptian Pammenes and Ptolemaeus (or Seleucus), who were exiled in AD 65 and 69 respectively (Cramer 1954: 272–3, Barton 1994: 50).

**562** *genium*: ‘here hardly differs from *ingenium*’ Courtney; cf. Mart 6.61.10.

**563–4** *cui uix ... | ... Seripho*: the *mathematicus* was lucky to be exiled, not executed. The assigning of exiles to an island, a practice begun in Augustus’ court, hardened by AD 12 into an official policy, almost all exiles from then on being sent *ad insulam* (Cohen 2008: 215–16). A favoured destination (Plut. *De exil.* 603b, Bingham 2003: 392–4) was the rocky and infertile Cyclades, which included Seriphos, an especially wretched place (*Poetae comici Graeci Adesp.* 729 K–A, Plut. *De exil.* 602a, Sen. *Helv.* 6.4 *deserta loca et asperrimas insulas Sciathum et Seriphum*): harsh conditions, as well as enforced isolation, being part of the punishment (Tac. *Ann.* 4.21, 14.48, Drogula 2011: 241–3, 251, 256–7).

**564** *parua ... Seripho*: the smallness of the island increased the misery of the exile’s lot: cf. Juv. 10.170, 1.73 *aude aliquid breuibus Gyris ... dignum. tandem caruisse Seripho* ‘to have eventually to do without Seriphos’: ironic, as if remaining on the island were something desirable. Reading *careo* thus (*OLD* s.v. 2a) meets the objection of Nisbet 1995: 240 ‘surely

*caruisse* should be replaced by a word that sustains the irony of *paene perit* and *uix mitti*; he suggested *iacuisse*, ‘languished’ or *latuisse* (Schrader). Furthermore, it is implicit in 562 that the astrologer is on hand for consultation: *tandem caruisse* explains how this came about. For the possibility of recall from exile see Braginton 1944: 406.

**565–8** The woman consults the astrologers as to when various relatives, whose inheritance she is eager to claim, will die. ‘Prediction of the time and manner of death was one of the most important activities of the ancient astrologer, though it was illegal’ (Barton 1994: 2; cf. Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 404). For astrology used by those hoping for the premature death of a close relation cf. Juv. 3.42–4 *motus | astrorum ignoro: funus promittere patris | nec uolo nec possum*. J.’s woman is so greedy that she enquires not just about her mother, but about a whole host of possible sources of inheritance.

**565** *ictericae* ‘suffering from jaundice’: a Greek term in place of the more common Latin *arquatus*. For the wish that a diseased party should die, in order that one may inherit from them, cf. Pers. 2.12–14. **lento**: too slow for her liking. Cf. Vell. Pat. 2.67.2 *adeo difficilis est hominibus utcumque conceptae spei mora*, in a similar context to here.

**566** *ante tamen de te*: the first person the woman wants out of the way is her husband, acting in total contradiction to the behaviour expected of a wife (cf. 567–8n.): her motives are to inherit and to clear the path for her lover (567). **Tanaquil tua**: in this context of prognostication the reference must be to Tanaquil’s legendary skill in interpreting omens (cf. Liv. 1.34, 39), not (ironically) to her exemplary character (Courtney).

**567–8** *an sit uicturus adulter | post ipsam*: a satirical reconstitution of the wish, often expressed in epitaphs by wives, that their spouse should outlive them (cf. CLE 111.39–40 *felix, maritum si superstitem mihi | diui dedissent*; Latimore 1962: 203–4, Horsfall 1985: 272). The perversion of marital values is ironised in the rhetorical question *quid... maius dare numina possunt?*

**569–70** *quid sidus... | ...astro*: in astrology, the planets were believed to exert either a benign influence (the ‘benefics’ Jupiter, Venus and the Moon) or an evil one (the ‘malefics’ Saturn and Mars; the Sun and Mercury could be either): the effect was lessened or intensified depending on a planet’s position in relationship to the signs of the Zodiac, each planet having two ‘houses’ (diurnal and nocturnal), Zodiacal signs in which their influence was increased, as well as ‘exaltations’ and ‘depressions’, positions in relation to these two signs in which a planet’s influence was strongest or weakest respectively (Barton 1994: 96–7). **sidus triste...** | **Saturni**: the planet Saturn was regarded as maleficent because

in mythology Saturn/Kronos castrated his father and swallowed his children (Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 93-7, Barton 1994: 112).

**570 quo laeta Venus se proferat astro** ‘in what sign of the Zodiac Venus appears exerting a favourable influence’. If this refers to the exaltation (569-70n.), the sign would be Pisces: see Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 195, Goold 1977: xcvi-xcix, Barton 1994: 109. Alternatively, in view of *laeta* (lit. ‘happy’), the allusion might be to the belief that each planet had a preference for a house, or more accurately, houses, in which they were particularly happy (χαίρειν): cf. Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 182; in the case of Venus, these were Libra (diurnal) and Taurus (nocturnal): cf. Goold 1977: xcix.

**571** refers to horary or catarchic astrology, which was based on the notion that days were lucky or unlucky depending on the position of the planets and Zodiacal signs, and was not dependent on an individual’s horoscope. It was often used to determine the best times for engaging in enterprises such as buying land, forming a business partnership or payment of debts (Barton 1994: 175); see also Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 458-65. **mensis:** often closely associated, as here, with the signs of the Zodiac, e.g. Manil. 2.202.

**572-6** The woman of these lines, in contrast to the one ignorant of astrology (569), has no need to consult an astrologer, but herself pores over and knows how to interpret the various aids that an astrologer would use: almanacs, numerological tables, a book of lucky and unlucky days, a horoscope, a textbook by Petosiris.

**572 memento:** a dignified word, imparting a tone of mock-solemnity (cf. Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 10.3-4).

**573-4 in cuius manibus ceu pinguia sucina tritas | cernis ephemeridas:** the woman carries her almanac tablets around with her, thumbing them much as women rubbed lumps of amber (*sucina*), which they bore on their person, to produce a fragrant scent (see Watson 1992).

**573 pinguia** ‘glutinous, resinous’: amber is the fossilised resin of a species of pine. Cf. Mart. 4.59.3 *pingui...rore*, Plin. *HN* 37.36.

**574 ephemeridas:** tables listing the positions of the planets, which could be used to determine the best times to undertake or avoid various activities; cf. Plin. *HN* 29.9 *ad siderum motus ex ephemeride mathematica cibos dando horasque observando*. For a similar obsession – not confined to female members of the upper class – cf. Amm. Marc. 28.4.24 (many aristocrats can’t dine or bathe without consulting the *ephemerides* to know for example where is the sign of Mercury or what part of Cancer the moon is in).

**575–6 quae ... | non ibit pariter:** if the prognosticatory signs are adverse (576n.), she will not accompany her husband either to a foreign command or back home if his term of service is over.

**575 patriamque:** *-que* = ‘or’, as often (unless *patriamue* is correct, *-ue* being apt to be changed to *-que* in the MSS of J.).

**576 numeris reuocata Thrasylli:** i.e. if the numerical calculations as prescribed in a textbook by Thrasyllus predict a bad end to the journey. Cramer 1954: 21 cites a numerological prognostication ascribed to Thrasyllus, in which the figures resulting from calculations too elaborate to explore here supposedly foretell whether a traveller will arrive safely or perish. **Thrasylli:** an astrologer and intellectual who lived under Tiberius, whose friendship was highly valued by the emperor and who was even said to have calculated correctly the hour of his own death (Dio 58.27.3). See further Cramer 1954: 92–108, Barton 1994: 43–4.

**577 ad primum lapidem:** so obsessive is the woman that she has to enquire about even the shortest journey.

**578 si prurit frictus ocelli | angulus:** itching was a sign of *lippitudo*, bleariness of the eyes, a very common affliction (109n.): cf. Celsus, *Med.* 2.7.8 *si frons prurit, lippitudinis metus est*.

**579 inspecta genesi collyria poscit:** she begins treatment for *lippitudo* only after consulting her horoscope. In reality, horoscopes were used only to predict the outcome of a disease rather than to treat it (Barton 1994: 187–8): for the latter, the horary method (571n.) was preferred; cf. Dorotheus, *Carm. Astr.* 5.40 Pingree (treatment for an eye infection should be commenced when Jupiter and Venus (as opposed to Mars) are with the Moon). **collyria:** eye salves consisting of a glutinous paste, used to relieve ocular complaints, *lippitudo* included: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.30–1 *hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus* | *illinere*: for recipes see Celsus, *Med.* 6.6.

**580–1:** as noted on 579, horary astrology was commonly used in the treatment of illness, e.g. according to Dorotheus (*Carm. Astr.* 5.38.2 Pingree), medicine for diarrhoea should be taken when the moon is in Libra or Scorpio.

**581 Petosiris:** an Egyptian priest of the fourth century BC who, along with the earlier seventh-century king Nechepso, was reputed to be the founder of astrology. Many quotations from works ascribed to them are extant, including predictions of the outcome of illnesses (Barton 1994: 188–9), though none is earlier than the second century BC. See Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 563–4, Cramer 1954: 17–18, Barton 1994: 26.

**582–4** (cf. 588–91): fortune-tellers of various sorts, including astrologers, haunted the circus, where betting on the outcome of races (cf. Juv. 11.201–2) invited their use, but they were also available on non-race days for general consultation by those unable to afford anything better. Cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.132 with Pease, Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.113–14, Liv. 39.16.8, Cameron 1976: 60 n. 1, Wiseman 1987: 181–2.

**582** *mediocris* = *humilis*, ‘of plebeian rank’: cf. Juv. 11.177, *OLD mediocris* 5c. If she is identical with the woman of 588–91, the reference to her prospective marriage (*nubat* 591) establishes that she is either freeborn or formally manumitted. *lustrabit* ‘she will traverse’ (*OLD* s.v. 3a).

**582–3** *spatium ... utrimque* | *metarum* ‘the space on each side of the turning posts’, i.e. at each end of the *spina* (Duff). *utrimque* + genitive is a Greek usage (see Courtney).

**583** *metarum*: conical bronze pillars in a group of three, operating as turning posts, at each end of the *spina*, a long marble platform which ran down the middle of the racing track in the Circus Maximus. *sortes ducet*: refers to cleromancy (divination by drawing lots containing written responses which were interpreted by soothsayers), a widespread practice: cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.12, 2.86 with Pease, Tib. 1.3.11–12. It could be sought in centres such as the temple of Fortuna at Praeneste, or, as here, from itinerant *sortilegi*: cf. Apul. *Met.* 9.8, where disreputable priests of the Syrian goddess earn their living by interpreting for gullible clients an all-purpose *sors*.

**583–4** *frontemque ...* | *... uati*: the allusions are to metoposcopia (predicting the future from people’s faces) and chiromancy (palmistry). For the former, see Suet. *Tit.* 2, Plin. *HN* 35.88, Hopfner, *RE* XIV 1288 s.v. *mantike*; for the latter, Pack 1972. Palmistry was regarded with suspicion (Artem. 2.69); its use as here by the lower classes, along with its close association with astrology, is suggested by a fragment of a chiromantic text which says that persons born under the sign of Ares whose time-line and life-line meet will never be manumitted if slaves, or will suffer poverty if free (Pack 1972: 377).

**584** *crebrum poppysma roganti*: the soothsayer asks his client to keep making popping sounds to ensure a favourable outcome. Such sounds, which had an apotropaic function (i.e. to ward off bad luck), were commonly employed in magic (e.g. *PGM* 4.560–3, 578–80) or to avert the evil omen of lightning (Plin. *HN* 28.25; cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 625, Dieterich 1910: 40–1).

**585–6** *responsa dabit Phryx augur et inde* | *conductus*: as it stands, the meaning must be ‘replies will be given by a Phrygian augur, and one hired from there’ i.e. a Phrygian augur who is actually hired from Phrygia and

so is genuine, as opposed to a fraud styling himself thus. This seems unexceptionable: it fits with the overall thrust of 582–91, that rich women can afford to consult the very best seers, while the (equally superstitious) *plebeiae* must resort to practitioners of far less standing. Housman preferred *dabunt*, the reading of the best manuscript (P), positing a lacuna after *inde* which contained a second subject for *dabunt*. But in view of the singular verb *dabit* with two subjects in 586–7, there seems no reason why J. should have put a plural in 585.

**585 diuitibus:** in emphatic position at the beginning of the line and in antithesis to *plebeium* (588). **Phryx augur:** *augur* has its literal sense of a person skilled in the art of divination from the movements of birds. While possibly hinting at the dubious influence that Eastern seers exercise upon the superstitious minds of women (cf. 542–52), *Phryx* primarily intimates that the rich woman can afford to engage the best: the Phrygians were among a number of Eastern races especially knowledgeable in the augural art (Cic. *Div.* 1.92, 94, 2.80), sometimes being credited with its invention, e.g. Isid. *Etym.* 8.9.32; cf. Pease on Cic. *Div.* 1.92.

**586 astrorum mundique peritus:** an expert astrologer as opposed to the mountebanks resorted to by the poor woman.

**587 atque ‘or’.** **aliquis senior qui publica fulgura condit:** lightning strikes, being an omen, had to be expiated by a member of the *collegium* of *haruspices*, who interpreted the portent and saw to the burial (*OLD condo* 4b) of everything scorched by the lightning (Luc. 1.606–8; Thulin 1906: 92–8, MacBain 1982: 50–1). The rich woman, in order to determine the will of the gods, employs only the best type of *haruspex*, fulgural lore being the most important aspect of the *haruspices*’ discipline. **senior:** as opposed to *haruspices* of lesser status. The precise point is unclear. Senior *haruspices* may have been assigned public prodigies, while private ones were dealt with by *iuniores*: so Thulin 1906: 87. Alternatively the implied contrast is between *haruspices* who dealt in fulgural law and the humbler, salaried *haruspices* who read the entrails in sacrifices (cf. Rawson 1978: 140–1).

**588** Deleted by Nisbet 1995: 244–5. His arguments rely on the assumption that *mediocris* 582 and *plebeium* 588 refer to different classes of female, which results in incoherence, since the *mediocris* goes to an inferior part of the circus (*spatium... utrimque* | *metarum* 582–3), while the ‘plebeian’, who should be of lesser status, goes to the more central (and presumably better) part of the circus (590). But there is no evidence that one part of the circus was considered inferior to another, and crucially, the introduction of a third group of women blurs the clear distinction in this section between the divinatory resources available to the wealthy and the humble.



Moreover, J. in general divides women into either the rich or the poor. It is accordingly neater to regard the *mediocres* as identical with the ‘plebeians’ (582n.). **positum est** ‘depends upon’. **aggere**: the embankment, part of the wall built by Servius Tullius from the Esquiline to the Colline Gate (Liv. 1.44.3, *LTUR* s.vv. *muris Serui Tullii*) and a favourite place for walks and entertainments (cf. Juv. 5.153–5; see also Wiseman 1998). The detail seems a little superfluous, since J.’s focus is otherwise upon consultation by the *plebeiae* of soothsayers in the circus (582–4, 590–1).

**589 quae nudis longum ostendit ceruicibus aurum**: a woman who displays a long gold necklace on her bare neck. A puzzling way to characterise a woman of the poorer classes, which she must be (590, 582–3, 588, 591). As Nisbet 1995: 244 points out, ‘while a few women of lower station might possess a golden necklace, it seems absurd to characterise the whole class in this way’. Olson 2002: 399 speculates that the reference here is to gold-plated ornaments ‘which lower-class women wore in imitation of elite status-symbols’. Be this as it may, it seems better to focus on the detail of the bare neck, regarding this as an indicator of her humble status: a *matrona* of higher social standing appearing in public would be garbed in the *stola*, which left little of the neck exposed (illustrations in Scholz 1992: pls. 1–2, and (late first-century AD) pls. 30–2). Admittedly, the *stola* may have been available to married women of the lower classes (Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3, intro. 27–32), but working females might not have worn the cumbersome and hot *matrona*’s costume on an everyday basis even if they were entitled to it (Olson 2008: 32).

**590 falas**: temporary wooden towers erected on the *spina* (cf. 583n. *metarum*), from the top storey of which important persons could safely take part in hunts or battles by launching missiles (*falarica*). So Humphrey 1986: 266, referring to Serv. Dan. on *Aen.* 9.702, but by J.’s day the circus was no longer used for such purposes, and unless he is being anachronistic, the structures must simply have been used by spectators at the races: see Non. 163 L. **delphinorumque columnas**: seven bronze dolphins and seven marble eggs were set upon columns placed on opposite ends of the *spina*, one of each being removed or lowered to indicate the completion of a lap. The dolphins, speediest of animals, were introduced by Agrippa, perhaps as a tribute to his patron Neptune (associated with dolphins) or as an allusion to Olympia, where a dolphin was dropped to signal the start of the race. Cf. Humphrey 1986: 262–5.

**591**: the woman’s question (should/will she divorce the innkeeper and marry the cloak-seller?) is appropriate to her class, both being engaged

in banausic occupations. **saga uendenti:** a *sagarius*, dealer in *saga*, properly military cloaks, but being of coarse cloth, also worn by humble persons: cf. Mart. 6.11.8 with Grewing. **nubat:** either deliberative subjunctive ('whether to marry') or present subjunctive in an indirect question with reference to the future ('if she will marry'; cf. Plaut. *Most.* 58 *qui scis an tibi istuc eueniat prius quam mihi?*, *efferat* 567). The former, perhaps more natural, can be supported by Dorotheus, *Carm. Astr.* 5.16.3, 9 Pingree, who advises divorce (cf. *caupone relicto*) if at the time of the marriage Venus was with Mars or Saturn, or the Moon in Aries. On the other hand, astrologers and fortune-tellers were usually concerned not with *whether* to undertake an enterprise, but with the appropriate times for doing so, or else they predicted what was going to happen (cf. 548 *spondet amatorem tenerum* and the woman's consultations about the fate of her relatives 565–8). In view of this prognosticatory rôle, the second alternative should not be ruled out. **caupone:** an innkeeper, who sold wine and offered lodging to travellers (Kleberg 1957: 1–6). *caupones* were often slaves, and of Eastern origin (cf. Juv. 8.159, Lucil. 128 Marx, Kleberg 1957: 77), though mention of marriage suggests that this *caupo* is a freedman or a freeborn member of the plebs (cf. 582n. *mediocris*).

**592–609** *But at least women of the lower classes endure the risks of childbirth and the hard work of breast-feeding. Hardly any wealthy woman gives birth. Such is the power of their drugs. Just as well: were your wife prepared to go through with a pregnancy, you might find yourself the 'father' of a black African, sole heir to your estate. As for supposititious children foisted on unsuspecting families, many a supposed aristocrat began life by exposure beside the public cesspits. Fortuna takes malicious glee in promoting such foundlings and inserting them in patrician households.*

According to 592–601, contraceptives and abortifacients combine to ensure that scarcely any upper-class woman produces a child. Much work has been done in recent years on ancient contraceptive devices; there is however considerable disagreement on how effective they were (595n.). As regards abortion, ancient attitudes were anything but straightforward. The stance of the medical profession was by no means uniform (Kapparis 2002: 71–8), and the issue complicated by significant differences of opinion concerning when human life began (Kapparis 2002: 34–52, 201–13). Nor was abortion illegal under Roman law, until criminalised in the early third century AD (the statement of Musonius 15 to the contrary is mere wishful thinking): cf. Kapparis 2002: 174–85. A number of writers, however, simply condemned it as abhorrent. Notable instances are Muson. 15, Sen. *Helv.* 16.3 and Plin. *HN* 10.172 *in hominum genere maribus deuerticula ueneris excogitata omnia, scelera naturae, feminis uero abortus*. It is with such voices that the Speaker aligns himself, going so far as to represent abortion as homicide (596n.).

The second topic in 592–609 is the introduction of supposititious children into noble households, in the shape of foundlings abandoned by their parents. Exposure of children was widely practised in Antiquity (Harris 1994), for various reasons (Harris 1994: 11–15, Corbier 2001: 61). Although individual voices are raised against child abandonment (Muson. 15, Philo *Spec. leg.* 3.110–19, Tac. *Germ.* 19.2 with Rives, Epictet. *Diss.* 1.23), it was accepted that a Roman father had the right to decide not to rear a child and that ‘over the centuries... the exposure of newborn babies in Rome was perfectly legal and socially acceptable’ (Corbier 2001: 66). Given the resultant easy availability of foundlings, and that accusations of *suppositio partus* are widespread in misogynistic contexts (Ar. *Thesm.* 407–8, 502–16, 339–41 with Austin-Olson, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 17.50–2), it appears that – notwithstanding the number of lines devoted to the *lusus Fortunae* – the primary target in 602–9 is the wickedness of *matronae* in foisting spurious children on their unsuspecting husbands, or ‘the absurdity of women who refuse to bear a child themselves yet provide their husband with a supposit[it]ious baby’ (Eyben 1980–1: 54). Beyond question the issue was a very serious one. Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.22 records a sensational case in which a Roman aristocrat was alleged to have falsified the paternity of her son, and Roman law viewed *suppositio partus* with the utmost gravity: cf. Paul. *Sent.* 2.24.9, Ulp. *Dig.* 25.4.1.13 *publice enim interest partus non subici, ut ordinum dignitas familiarumque salua sit* – precisely what does not occur here.

**592 hae:** the poor women who conclude the preceding section. **partus...discrimen:** the dangers of childbirth were considerable in Antiquity: cf. Soran. *Gyn.* 1.30, 2.18, Plut. *De amore prolis* 496c ‘great dangers and travail’, Plaut. *Truc.* 518 *qui* [the alleged father] *me interfecisti paene uita et lumine*, Gourévitch 1987, Demand 1994: 71–86.

**592–3 omnes | nutricis tolerant...labores:** for breast-feeding one’s child as ‘hard work’ cf. Gell. 12.1.5 *mater puellae [puerperae]...diceret adhibendas...puero nutrices, ne ad dolores, quos in enitendo tulisset, munus quoque nutritionis graue ac difficile accederet*, Muson. 3 (42 Lutz). Wet-nursing was routinely practised at elite levels of Roman society (7–11n.): the circumstances (*fortuna*) of the less well-off permitted no such luxury.

**593 nutricis:** lit. ‘of the wet nurse’, meaning in effect ‘of nursing’, a bold instance of concrete for abstract *nutriendi*: cf. [Quint.] *Decl. min.* 262 *repudiatae* [sc. *uxoris*]... *causa = repudii causa*, H–S 751.

**594 sed iacet...lecto:** claims that women as a whole, or certain classes of women – here the well-off – avoid childbirth by self-induced abortions are quite common: cf. [Ov.] *Nux* 23–4 *nunc uterum uitiat quae uolt formosa uideri | raraque in hoc aeuo est quae uelit esse parens*, [Quint.] *Decl. min.* 277.10, Plut.

*De san. tuend.* 134f, Kapparis 2002: 117–20. It is true that there were real concerns about maintaining population numbers at a satisfactory level (cf. Augustus' legislation promoting marriage and the production of children, and the institution of alimentary foundations under the Empire to provide financial assistance in rearing offspring). Likewise there is no reason to doubt the widespread availability of contraceptives and abortifacients, as suggested by J. Nonetheless, assertions like *sed iacet aurato uix ulla puerpera lecto* owe much to rhetorical exaggeration (Booth on *Ov. Am.* 2.14.9–12). There may, however, be a kernel of truth in what J. says: upper-class women might have had particular reasons for wishing to restrict their fertility, such as the need to provide large dowries in the case of daughters and diminution of family fortunes if there were many sons: cf. Eyben 1980–1: 80–1, McLaren 1990: 54. *iacet* 'lies in'. Cf. Varro, *Rust.* 2.10.8 *fetas nostras, quae in conopiis iacent dies aliquot*. *aurato...lecto*: a bed inlaid with gold: cf. Plaut. *Stich.* 377, Plin. *HN* 33.144 [*scimus*] *lectos uero iam pridem mulierum totos operiri argento... eadem et aureos fecit*, Marquardt 1886: 309–10.

**595–7 artes huius... | quae... | conducit:** in keeping with their presumed expertise, the purveyors of contraceptives and abortifacients are portrayed as female. Both Plato (*Th.* 149c–d) and Soranus (*Gyn.* 1.4) speak of midwives administering the latter; cf. also the nurse of Canace at *Ov. Her.* 11.37–44.

**595 tantum...possunt:** it suits the Speaker's argument to depict the contraceptive and abortion-inducing procedures of Roman women as extremely efficacious, but how true is this really? Regarding the efficacy of ancient contraceptive practices, scholars are divided: cf. Eyben 1980–1: 8–10 (in his view, largely worthless), McLaren 1990: 58–9 (some of the barrier methods may have worked), Hopkins 1965b: 134–6, Scarborough 1991: 158 (certain prescriptions may have been effective, but are often mixed indiscriminately with the ineffective or magical), Riddle 1992: 25–65 (pharmacological arguments that many contraceptive drugs may have worked: but see Frier 1994: 327–33 for a critique). As for abortifacients, Scarborough 1991: 145 implies by a case study of pennyroyal that some of the substances may have been effective: Riddle 1992: 25–65 notes that many of the contraceptive agents mentioned by Soranus and Dioscorides also have abortifacient powers. On balance it appears that certain of the contraceptive and abortive regimes recorded in Antiquity may have been effective, but J.'s *tantum* is surely satiric hyperbole.

**596–7 quae steriles facit atque homines in uentre necandos | conducit:** it seems natural to refer *steriles facit* to contraception and *homines... necandos* to abortion: cf. August. *De nupt. et concup.* 1.17, who distinguishes *sterilitatis*

*uenena* from the latter. But a degree of caution is necessary: while the difference between the two procedures was sometimes recognised (Soran *Gyn.* 1.60, Sokolowski 1955: no. 20.20), generally speaking the ancients did not distinguish between them with any precision (Hopkins 1965b: 136–42).

**596 homines in uentre necandos:** emotive language, putting the women's actions in the worst possible light. Similar terminology is used of abortion by Favorinus, ap. Gell. 12.1.9 (*in ipsis hominem primordiis... interfectum ire*) but the treatment of abortion as murder seems (prior to the Christian period) to be unique to J. and Favorinus. See further Booth on Ov. *Am.* 2.14.15. **necandos:** various possibilities were available: orally administered drugs, pessaries, externally applied substances, mechanical means such as physical exertion, surgical intervention and resort to magic (Kapparis 2002: 12–31).

**597 conducit** 'contracts for' (*OLD* s.v. 5a, often with a gerundive used predicatively as here) gives an unpleasant flavour of commercialism to the business. Soran. *Gyn.* 1.4 expresses strong disapproval of midwives who administer abortives for money. **gaude, infelix:** a brilliant oxymoron, addressed to the husband. What should notionally be a misfortune, because he was seemingly deprived of a son and heir (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 355–60, Cic. *Cluent.* 32 a woman who, by inducing an abortion, *spem parentis, memoriam nominis, subsidium generis, heredem familiae... sustul* [it]), is paradoxically a matter for rejoicing, because, had the pregnancy been carried to term, the baby would have been a palpable bastard (598–601). Gal. 17.438 Kühn, Soran. *Gyn.* 1.60 and Plut. *De san. tuend.* 134f suggest that abortion was commonly resorted to in order to conceal adultery.

**597–8 atque ipse... | porrige:** outrageously suggests that the husband should actively assist his wife to abort, it being in his interest to do so. Many abortives were in the form of potions (*bibendum*): cf. Kapparis 2002: 12–17.

**598 quidquid erit:** implying that a male would naturally have no knowledge of such substances. That this is untrue is suggested by Plin. *HN* 24.18 *portentum est quod tradunt abortiuum fieri in uenere cedri sucum ante perfusa uirilitate* ('rubbing it all over the male organ'): cf. also Kapparis 2002: 162–3.

**598–9 nam si... | ...salientibus:** J. stresses the physical discomforts of pregnancy (*distendere, uexare, salientibus*) to convey the wife's aversion to the process, but the graphic humorousness of the expression goes some way to undermining his disapproval of her.

**599 salientibus:** possibly a calque on ἀσκαρίζω, 'jump', which is sometimes used of the quickening process (Hippoc. 7.530 Littré, Gal. 4.543 Kühn),

but in this context probably also a sly allusion to leaping as a way of inducing an abortion (Hippoc. 7.488–90 Littré, Gal. 4.653–4, Soran. *Gyn.* 1.46, Macrobian. *In somn.* 1.6.64 (*saltibus*), Kapparis 2002: 22–3).

**599–600 esses | Aethiopsis fortasse pater:** *Aethiops* refers to the somatic type of the ‘black African’ (Thompson 1989: 62–85). The Roman *matrona* who gave birth to an *Aethiops* was a theme in declamation (Balsdon 1979: 218). Martial jests upon the topic (6.39.6–9); Plin. *HN* 7.51, Arist. *Gen. an.* 722a10–11 and Plut. *De sera* 563a report the procreative results of such miscegenation. Underlying such cases is a stereotypical perception of black hypersexuality and virility (cf. Clarke 1996) which supposedly exercised a sinister fascination upon notionally respectable *matronae*: see Thompson 1989: 107–9.

**600 pater:** used with similar irony by Martial of a *paterfamilias*’ pseudo-paternity of his wife’s bastards (6.39.1). **decolor heres:** *decolor* = ‘off-colour’, with reference both to deviation from the Roman somatic norm for skin colour (cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.130 *decolor Indus*, Sen. *Phaedr.* 345 *India...decolor*) and to the abnormality of the child’s complexion which betrays his servile paternity (cf. Bradley 2009: 139–45). The phrase *decolor heres* is oxymoronic, since a legitimate son/heir should have the same, not a different skin-tone from his father. Many explain *decolor* as ‘off-white, mulatto’, comparing the *νόθος Αἰθίοψ* of Ach. Tat. 3.9.2, who is explicitly said to have a lighter skin colour than a pure-blooded Ethiopian, but J. is not interested in such chromatic niceties. For him the baby is simply an *Aethiops*.

**600–1 mox... | ...tabulas:** both J. and Mart. 6.39 on the adulterous wife who produces palpable bastards by her slaves (6–9 for Africans fathering these), maintain the fiction that her husband would accept the babies as his own: a fantastically implausible scenario, given not least that the decision on whether or not to rear a child lay with the father. J. goes further than Martial, making the child the husband’s sole heir, an additional implausibility, since disinheritance was possible in cases where a child was the product of adultery (*Dig.* 28.2.3, 28.2.14.2).

**600 mox** ‘presently, after a while’: cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.25.

**601 impleret tabellas:** i.e. would be *heres ex asse*, sole heir. For the expression cf. Juv. 2.58–9. **numquam tibi mane uidendus:** black was a sinister colour (Thompson 1989: 110–13) and to meet a black Ethiopian was seen as a bad omen (App. *B Civ.* 4.134, SHA *Sev.* 22.4–5, Snowden 1970: 179–80). Furthermore, to encounter someone or something ominous on leaving one’s house in the morning supposedly set an evil tone for the

whole day (Ar. *Ran.* 196, Lucian, *Pseudol.* 17, *Eun.* 6). Here the danger comes from within.

**602 transeo** ‘I pass over’ introduces a *praeteritio* of eight lines. **suppositos:** *suppositi* (ὑποβολιμαίοι) were the children of another woman passed off by a wife (or mistress) as her own for reasons which include, as here, the need to provide one’s husband with an heir (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 407–8, Dio Chrys. *Or.* 15.8). See further Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 17.50–2.

**602–3 et gaudia uotaque saepe | ad spurcos decepta lacus** ‘and feelings of joy and longings often deceived at filthy cisterns’, ‘deceived’ because the husband’s longing (*OLD* s.v. *uotum* 3) for a son appears to be answered, but in reality is not, the ‘son’ having been acquired at a public latrine. This was a favoured location for abandoning unwanted children, to judge from the copronyms of Roman Egypt, which seem at least in some cases to indicate that the bearers of these names had been picked up as foundlings ἀπὸ κοπρίας, ‘from the dung-heap’, or were descended from such (Pomeroy 1986). *lacus* are ‘artificial urban cess-pool[s] or cistern[s]’ (Brown 1994: 195). They were chosen as sites to deposit babies presumably because persons were constrained to visit these, given the almost complete absence of domestic sanitary facilities (Scobie 1986: 413–18): a much-discussed passage of Paulus (*Dig.* 25.3.4) speaks of exposing children in *publicis locis*, in the hope that this increased the chances of these being rescued by another.

**603–4 saepe inde petitos | pontifices, Salios:** the origins of the children make a mockery of the status qualifications pertaining to priestly offices. *pontifices* were traditionally drawn from the elite (Beard 1990: 19–28), and since Augustus the four great priestly *collegia* (*pontifices*, *augures*, *quindecimviri*, *septemviri*) and the old associations of the Fetiales, Salii, Arval Brethren and Titii were filled exclusively by men of senatorial rank (Wisowa, *RK* 492). Further, the Salii, the leaping priests of Mars (Wisowa, *RK* 554–9), had to be patricians (Cic. *Dom.* 38) and, if not born so, were in imperial times invested with patrician status prior to their adlection (*RE* II 1.1882 s.v.).

**604–5 Scaurorum ... | ...laturos:** the Scauri were a distinguished patrician family of the *gens Aemilia*. In fact the line had long been extinguished (Sen. *Suas.* 2.22, Tac. *Ann.* 6.29, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I no. 404). While most foundlings who survived their exposure ended up as slaves (Harris 1994: 9–10), certain remarks of Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 15.7) regarding distinguished Athenians who have turned out to be supposititious suggest that J.’s claims may not be pure fiction, although *saepe* is plainly an exaggeration.

**605 stat Fortuna:** the goddess *Fortuna* is envisaged as stationed beside the *spurci lacus*, waiting to take the foundlings into her care, but *stat* also

reflects iconographic representations of the goddess as standing (Kajanto 1981: 518). It may be relevant to the cesspools of 603 that Fortuna had a temple on the *clivus Capitolinus* near the *Porta Stercoraria* (Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4.51 (1.39 Dind.)). **improba**: commonly used to characterise Fortuna's malice and delight in working mischief, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 2.80: see further Kajanto 1981: 532.

**606 arridens nudis infantibus** 'smiling on the new-born infants exposed there naked' Duff (cf. *pueris dulce arridens* Sil. 11.390). But in view of *improba* and *secretum* (608), *arridens* also suggests the quizzical smile of a deity who is party to information to which mortals are not privy: cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.27.66–7, Puelma 1960: 149 with n. 17. For Fortune's smile, cf. also Petr. 133.3.12 *et quandoque mihi fortunae arriserit hora*. **nudis**: for exposed infants left unclad cf. Suet. *Claud.* 27.1–2, [Quint.] *Decl. min.* 306.23 (most, it seems, were clothed: cf. Köves-Zulauf 1990: 20–4, who, however, cites only Greek evidence). The detail underscores the dramatic change in status to which Fortuna will subject them.

**606–7 hos fouet omni | inuoluitque sinu**: 'Fortune...[is] treating the [new-born infants] like a fond mother' Duff: cf. Tac. *Dial.* 28.4. There is some evidence for Fortuna having maternal associations (Cic. *Div.* 2.85, an epithet *mammosa* at *CIL* VI 975 col. 4.42). Courtney compares Oedipus' self-characterisation *qua* foundling as παῖδα τῆς Τύχης...|...| τῆς γὰρ πέφυκα μητρός Soph. *OT* 1080–2). More pertinent is the sneer *Fortunae filius* applied to persons who attained a status from which their origins should have disqualified them (Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 4.6). **omni | inuoluitque sinu**: for the expression cf. Pers. 5.36–7. *omni* stands for *toto*, as at Catull. 76.22 *expulit ex omni pectore laetitias*.

**607 porrigit** 'presents'. Cf. 6.43.

**608 secretumque sibi mimum parat**: Fortune's sport, a familiar trope (Hor. *Carm.* 3.29.49–50 with N–R, Kajanto 1981: 531), can as here assume the form of advancing to high estate the lowliest of individuals (cf. Juv. 3.38–40 *cum sint | quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum | extollit quotiens uoluit Fortuna iocari*, Plin. *Ep.* 4.11.2): an idea underlined by *mimum*, since mime-plots specialised in abrupt reversals of fortune (Cic. *Phil.* 2.65).

**608–9 his se | ingerit** 'she forces herself upon them': cf. Luc. 2.263–4 *ingeret omnis | se belli fortuna tibi*.

**609 suos...alumnos** 'as her particular foster-children'. *alumnos* reinforces the idea that Fortuna looks upon the foundlings with great fondness (*hos amat* 608), the relationship between fosterer and foster-child being almost invariably one of great affection: cf. Curt. 3.6.1 *non ut regem modo sed etiam ut alumnum eximia caritate diligebat*, Rawson 1986a: 173–9, Nielsen 1987.



**producit** ‘promotes’: cf. *CIL* XIV 2113 *alumno Faustinae Aug. producto ab imp. M. Aurel. Commodo*; *OLD* s.v. 8). But foundlings were by no means always so fortunate: see e.g. *Sen. Controv.* 10.4, also 604–5n.

**610–26** *Women employ magic spells and philtres to disturb their husbands’ reason. The result is mental befuddlement and forgetfulness, or worse, outright insanity. This is why Caligula went mad and murdered senators and equites indiscriminately. The damage done by Agrippina’s poisoned mushroom was by contrast slight. It merely saw off one enfeebled old Emperor.*

Women are often accused of deploying spells (*magicos...cantus* 610) and especially love philtres (*philtrā* 611) against their husbands or lovers, in an attempt either to regain or to intensify the target’s passion for them (Faraone 1999: 113–19). Often mental perturbation (611–14) or outright madness, as in Caligula’s case (615–20), was the result: cf. *Ov. Ars* 2.105–6 *nec data profuerint pallentia philtra puellis*.| *philtrā nocent animis uimque furoris habent* and *Hor. Epod.* 5.75–6 with Watson (further parallels and bibliography). *Plut. Prae. coniug.* 139a graphically describes the effects of such a magical regime: ‘women who contrive love-potions and magic spells (φίλτρα τινὰ καὶ γοητείας) against their husbands and gain the mastery over them through pleasure find themselves living with men who are senseless, foolish and spoiled’. Generally speaking, alienation of the senses is an unintended consequence of the *philtrā*, but on occasion wives are alleged *deliberately* to have unseated their husbands’ reason by philtres and spells: cf. *Ar. Thesm.* 561 (with Austin-Olson) ‘[nor did I mention]...how another woman made her husband insane with *pharmaka*’, where the context makes clear that this was intentional, *Tac. Ann.* 4.22.4. That this is what J. has in mind here is suggested by the purpose clause (611–12) *quibus ualeat mentem uexare mariti | et solea pulsare nates*. The wife’s object is to gain mastery over the husband by such unnatural means, as Cleopatra is alleged to have done with Antony (*Plut. Ant.* 37.6, 60.1). Similarly, in his account of the madness supposedly inflicted on Caligula by his wife Caesonia’s administration to him of a love-philtre, Josephus, *AJ* 19.193 states that her intention was to put him under an erotic spell (ἐρώτων ἐπαγωγάς), but first and foremost to effect ἐννοιῶν δούλωσιν, ‘enslavement of his wits’.

**610–11** *hic...cantus... | philtra*: for male pedlars of incantations and magic potions cf. *Pl. Resp.* 364b–c, Theopomp. fr. 3 (7.710 K–A), Lucian, *De merc. cond.* 40 ‘for many (πολλοί), making their way into households... have promised predictions, magic potions, love-charms and incantations against enemies’. For *philtrā* and incantations used in combination cf. also *Xen. Mem.* 2.6.10, 3.11.16, *Sen. Ep.* 9.6.

**610** *Thessala*: Thessaly was famously a home of witchcraft, its sorceresses particularly notorious: cf. N–H on *Hor. Carm.* 1.27.21, Hill 1973. The

adjective may be used as a generic term for ‘magical’ (cf. Phillips 2002), or may signify that the ingredients for the *philtr* came (or supposedly came) from Thessaly, which was rich in magic herbs (Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 749, Hor. *Epod.* 5.21–22, Luc. 6.438–42).

**611 *philtr*** ‘love philtres’: on the semantic range of the term see Faraone 1999: 25. **quibus ualeat mentem uexare mariti**: 610–26n. **ualeat** ‘she [the *uxor*] can’ (*OLD* 6a).

**612 *solea pulsare nates*** ‘to slap his buttocks with a slipper’ (βλαυτοῦν) in the manner of a child (cf. Lucian, *Dial.* D.19.1 ‘last time I even took a sandal to [Eros] behind’, Pers. 5.169 *solea, puer, obiurgabere rubra*, Gow 1956: 232). For wives dispensing such humiliating treatment to their husbands cf. *Anth. Pal.* 10.55.5, *Anth. Lat.* 145.3 SB *cur tua femineo caeduntur tergora socco?*, also Ter. *Eun.* 1027–8, Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 10. J. uses *nates*, more vulgar than *clunes* (334n.), to suit the undignified context. **desipis**: literalises the thought of 28, that a man who marries is mad. **inde**: sc. *a philtris*.

**613 *animi caligo***: *animi* or *mentis caligo* signifies various kinds of intellectual malfunction. The meaning here is probably the ‘fogging’ of mental faculties due to the wife’s magic (cf. *PGM* 19a.51–3, 61.16 ‘darken her wits (σκοτώσον): let her not know where she is’). But given the use of *caligo* at Catull. 64.207–8 *caeca mentem caligine Theseus* | *consitus* to characterise forgetfulness (cf. *obliuio*), an allusion to the latter cannot be ruled out. In that case the two noun phrases of 613 refer to the same thing.

**613–14 *magna obliuio rerum* | *quas modo gessisti***: it is characteristic of magic to induce forgetfulness in the victim, most commonly in love-magic (cf. *philtr* 611), where the target is enjoined to forget all parties except the spell-caster and sometimes everyday activities as well (cf. Faraone 1999: 86–9, Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 5.69–70, Petropoulos 1988: 218–20). But the inducing of forgetfulness can extend to other types of magic as well: cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.220–1, 10.235–6 ‘[Circe] mixed in the food baneful drugs, so that they might utterly forget (λαθοίατο) their native land’.

**614A–C** These lines do not belong here and may not be Juvenalian. They are not found in either the best or the majority of the MSS and, where they are, they appear in different places, or in the margin. Crucially in favour of excision, the sequence *tamen hoc tolerabile, si non* | *et furere incipias* etc. (614, 615) is quite unexceptionable. 614A–B refer to the Danaids, in that version of their punishment where not only the jars (*dolia*) into which the water is poured but also the vessels used to transport the water (*urnis*) are leaky (cf. N–R on Hor. *Carm.* 3.11.26–7, Costa on Sen. *Med.* 748–9). Were the lines to be retained, they would have to refer analogically

to a magically-induced lust for the wife that could never be satisfied, but it is by no means clear that this is the *primary* purpose of the *uxor's* spells (610–26n.). As for 614C, it is hard to get much sense out of the verse. Green translates ‘maddened by which you [Caligula] proved not our king, but a Phalaris’. But it is strained in the extreme to refer the second person *dedisti* to Caligula when he is in the same line described sarcastically as *nostro... rege*.

**615–17** Cf. Suet. *Calig.* 50 *creditur* [Caligula] *potionatus a Caesonia uxore amatorio quidem medicamento, sed quod in furorem uerterit*, Joseph. *AJ* 19.193 and Schol. Juv. *ad loc.* Barrett 1989: 214 is deeply sceptical. It was at any rate a central element in the historical tradition on Caligula that he was mad (cf. Wardle 1994: 331), even though this is unlikely to be true (Schrömbges 1988, Barrett 1989: 214–16).

**615 et furere incipias:** [Mental confusion caused by a philtre would be tolerable provided (614)] you didn’t actually go raving mad as well (*et*), like Caligula. **ut auunculus ille Neronis:** Agrippina, Nero’s mother, was Caligula’s sister. The periphrasis damns Caligula by association.

**616–17 cui... | infudit** refers to *hippomanes*, literally ‘horse-madness’, a potent love-charm of which three differing accounts are found (Tupet 1986: 2653–7). J. follows that version in which it is a fleshy excrescence on the head of a foal, *pullus*, bitten off at birth by its mother: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.515–16 with Pease. In reality *hippomanes* (in this understanding of it) seems to be a fibrous substance in shape like a hen’s egg which floats in the amniotic liquid that envelops the foetus. Expelled at the moment of birth, it can attach itself to any part of the newborn’s body (Tupet 1986: 2656). Its alleged potency as a love philtre derives from association with the supposed hypersexuality of mares (Arist. *Hist. an.* 572a8–12).

**616 totam:** as usual when madness (or death) supervenes after being given a love potion, this results from an overdose: cf. Plin. *HN* 25.25, Plut. *Luc.* 43, Ach. Tat. 4.15, Faraone 1999: 113–19. **tremuli:** ‘unsteady because new-born’ Courtney.

**617 infudit:** properly ‘pour into’, *infundo*, like ἐγχέειν (Antiph. 1.19), is used of administering drugs or poisons (*TLL* VII 1.1503.57–70). **quae... uxor?** women of all classes will inevitably ape the deplorable actions of the empress (in this case by administering love charms to their husbands): for similar sentiments cf. Juv. 2.65–7 *sed quid | non facient alii, cum tu multicia sumas*, | *Cretice?*, 8.198–9.

**618 ardebant cuncta et fracta compage ruebant:** for Caligula’s reign characterised as a conflagration cf. Sen. *Ad Polyb.* 17.3 *a quo imperium adustum atque euersum funditus*, Suet. *Calig.* 11 Tiberius said [*se Gaium*] *Phaethontem*

*orbi terrarum educare. fracta compage ruebant* echoes Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.7–8 *si fractus illabatur orbis, | impavidum ferient ruinae* and Sen. *Q Nat.* 6.32.4 *frangatur licet caelum*, but these allude to the heavens, whereas here *cuncta* = ‘the world, the Empire’. Sources on Caligula stress the havoc that he wreaked on the world as a whole (Joseph. *AJ* 19.1, 193 τὰ πάντα . . . τῆς . . . οἰκουμένης, Sen. *De ira* 3.16.2 *perierunt omnia*, Sen. and Suet. *supra*). Fire and *ruina* often appear together as metaphors for destruction (Duff). **compage**: the ‘structure’ comprising the world: cf. Luc. 1.72–3 *sic, cum compage soluta | saecula tot mundi suprema coegerit hora* with Roche.

**619–20 non aliter . . . | insanum**: J. may have in mind Hom. *Iliad* 14, where Hera borrows Aphrodite’s magic girdle in order to enflame Zeus with irresistible and irrational (217) desire – albeit not madness. It is relevant to the possible allusion that Caligula assimilated himself to Jupiter (Dio Cass. 59.26.5, 26.8, 28.3, 28.5–8).

**620–1 minus . . . Agrippinae | boletus**: J. follows what became the dominant account of Claudius’ death, that he was killed by a poisoned mushroom at the contrivance of his wife Agrippina (Tac. *Ann.* 12.66–7, Plin. *HN* 22.92, Dio Cass. 60.34.2–3, Juv. 5.146–8), this being a food of which he was inordinately fond (Suet. *Claud.* 44.2). Certainly a mushroom was a suitable dish in which to conceal a poison, for the dangers of eating these were well known (Sen. *Ep.* 77.18, Plin. *HN* 22.96). Moreover, Agrippina seems to have acquired something of a reputation as a poisoner (Ginsburg 2006: 17, 37). But modern scholars (Levick 1990: 77, Hurley 2001: 236) are sceptical about the mushroom tale, noting that Claudius was elderly, in bad health and bibulous, although careful to add that his death was very convenient for Agrippina. Grimm-Samuel 1991, leaving open the question of Agrippina’s responsibility, suggests that Tacitus’ account of Claudius’ symptoms is consistent with poisoning by an exceptionally toxic mushroom, *Amanita phalloides*, which is easily confused with a harmless variety of the genus *Amanita*.

**620 erit** ‘will prove to be’: cf. O25n.

**621 boletus**: a particularly delicious type of mushroom, favoured by gourmets (Sen. *Ep.* 95.24, Mart. 3.60.5), possibly named after the Spanish town of Boletum, modern Boltaña, still famous for mushrooms (Imholtz 1977). **siquidem** = *quandoquidem*, ‘since’. **praecordia pressit** ‘stopped the heart’. Cf. Luc. 9.815–16 *at tibi, Laeve miser, fixus praecordia pressit | Niliaca serpente cruor. praecordia*, properly ‘the parts below the heart’ often appears in connection with death by poison (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.96, Hor. *Epod.* 3.5, Apul. *Met.* 10.28.3).

**622 senis**: Claudius died in his sixty-fourth year.

**622–3** *tremulumque caput... | ...et longa manantia labra salia*: cf. Suet. *Claud.* 30 *risus indecens, ira turpior spumante rictu... caputque cum semper tum in quantulocumque actu uel maxime tremulum*, Dio Cass. 60.2.1, Sen. *Apocol.* 7.2.5. Claudius, it seems, suffered from cerebral palsy (Leon 1948, Levick 1990: 13–15). Given the inveterate tendency of the Ancients to mock bodily shortcomings (Garland 1995, Nisbet 1961: 194) and a cognate belief that Emperors should have an imposing appearance (Woodman on Vell. Pat. 2.94.2), it was inevitable that Claudius should be derided for his lack of physical coordination (cf. Sen. *Apocol.* 5), exactly as the imperial family had feared (Suet. *Claud.* 4). *caput descendere... | in caelum: ridens pro ad inferos* Schol., the joke being presumably that Claudius ought by rights to have gone down to Hades, instead of up to heaven. Claudius' deification was thought risible (Suet. *Ner.* 33. 1, Plin. *Pan.* 11.1): Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* plays up this fact by having the dead Emperor hauled off to Hades (*descendit ad inferos* 13.1: cf. 11.5) shortly after arrival in Olympus for an expected apotheosis. Seneca's brother Gallio similarly equivocated between the idea of ascent and descent with his remark (Dio Cass. 60.35.4) that 'Claudius had been raised to heaven with a hook' (persons executed in the prison – and hence bound for the Underworld – were dragged to the Tiber with hooks). The difficulty of the oxymoron is eased by the belief in a (variously conceptualised) subterrestrial *caelum* (Stat. *Theb.* 8.47 *et Stygio praetexam Hyperiona caelo*, Firm. Mat. *Math.* 2.15, Callim. *Aet.* fr. 177.6–7 with Pfeiffer), while the paradox of 'descending to heaven' is repeated in Pallad. *Anth. Pal.* 11.292 and *Epigr. Bob.* 50. On balance we prefer to retain the paradox. Suggested emendations include *discedere* (Castiglioni) and *decedere*, 'to depart this life – for the sky' (Nisbet 1995: 245).

**623** *manantia...salia*: the elevated *manare* (Urech 1999: 78–81) is humorously deflated by the gross *salia*.

**624–5** *haec...haec... | haec*: an emphatic contrast with the *ille* of 622, the effects of which were by comparison anodyne.

**624** *ferrum atque ignes*: proverbial (Häussler 1968: 238) and a hendiadys ('hot iron'). Metal plates (*laminae*) were heated and applied to the flesh of an offender: cf. Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.163 *ignes ardentisque laminae ceterique cruciatus admouebantur*, Prop. 4.7.35, Hor. *Epist.* 1.15.36–7. *torquet*: broadly speaking, torture of free persons was impermissible under the Republic, but the principle was eroded under the Principate, especially in *maiestas* cases and under emperors seen as tyrannical, when it was used as a means of punishment and to extract confessions (Mommsen 1899: 405–7, Garnsey 1970: 141–7). For its use by Caligula cf. Sen. *De ira* 3.18.3 *modo C. Caesar Sex. Papinium, cui pater erat consularis, Betilenum Bassum quaestorem*

*suum, procuratoris sui filium, aliosque et senatores et equites Romanos uno die flagellis cecidit, torsit, non quaestionis sed animi causa.*

**625 lacerat mixtos equitum cum sanguine patres** ‘mangled indiscriminately senators and men of equestrian blood’. For Caligula’s killing of senators cf. Dio Cass. 59.13.2, 18, 22.5–7; of *equites*, Dio Cass. 59.10.2, Joseph. *AJ* 19.3 and in general cf. Dio 59.13. 2–3 ‘many of the foremost men were killed ... [as were] many others of less prominence ... and in fact there was nothing but slaughter’ (probably an exaggeration, Barrett 1989: 234–41). Since *lacerare* cannot *stricto sensu* mean ‘kill’, the hyperbole likely stems from a specific case where Caligula supposedly contrived the literal tearing apart of a senator (*lacerandum* ... *traderent* Suet. *Calig.* 28, διέσπασαν Dio Cass. 59.26.2). The use of *lacerare* also invites a secondary interpretation in which the literal sense of *sanguis* is felt, ‘mangled senators together with the blood of equestrians’ (Nadeau).

**626 tanti...constat:** genitive of price, ‘so great was the cost of’ (*OLD* s.v. *consto* 11a). *tantus* and similar words often introduce a concluding *epiphonema*: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.33 quoted 501n. **partus equae:** 616–17n. **uenefica:** Caesonia. Not ‘witch’ or ‘poisoner’, but ‘user of love-potions’, reflecting the original sense of *uenenum*, ‘love-potion’ (Afran. 380–2 Ribb., Pharr 1932: 272–4), the noun being connected etymologically with *Venus*.

**627–61** *It is practically acceptable nowadays for a stepmother to kill a stepchild. Children left a rich inheritance are even poisoned by their own mothers. Now you might think, with all this talk of murderous women, that I am overriding the limits of satire and entering the realm of tragedy. Not so: the mother who murders her own offspring is no tragic fiction, but a brutal reality. Her tragic counterparts were at least inspired by furious anger. Nowadays such deeds are done in cold blood, for profit. It is unthinkable that a contemporary wife would sacrifice her life in place of her husband, as Alcestis did. Rome is full of husband-killers like Clytemnestra; but the means of disposal are far more subtle.*

The weapon of choice for the murderesses in this passage is poison (629–42, 659–61). J. reflects a widespread belief that poisoning was a peculiarly female crime: cf. Eur. *Ion* 616–17 ‘how many butcheries and destructions involving deadly poisons have women discovered for men’, Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.25 *latrocinium facilius in uiro, ueneficium in femina credas*, Tac. *Ann.* 2.71, Cic. *Cluent*, Marshall 1990: 55–6, Watson 1995: 87. It was often closely associated with adultery (Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.39, Berrino 2001). Here, however, the murderesses’ motives are purely financial.

A key motif of 627–61 is the comparison of contemporary women with the heroines of tragedy. The inspiration for this lies partly in discourses on marriage which adopt a cautionary approach to the institution. Nicostratus, *On marriage* Stob. 4.598 warns, in terms similar to lines 634–8, ‘women

are cleverest of all at inventing and weaving stratagems. *And if you do not believe me, you have only to read the tragedies*, to see what women did or plotted.' Seneca, warning in the *De matrimonio* against wicked wives (ap. Jer. *Adv. Iovinian.* 317c: cf. Bickel 1915: 336) not only utilises 'the likes of Clytemnestra and Eriphyle' (cf. 655–6) as paradigms of these, but also, like J. in 636–7, mimics dictionally the stylistic elevation of tragedy, peopled by such figures: *quid referam Pasiphaen, Clytemestras, et Eriphylas? ... quidquid tra-goediae tument et domos urbes regnaque subuertit, uxorum paelicumque contentio est.*

In the above passages, the use of tragic *exempla* to prove female wickedness is based on the implicit premise that the females of myth actually existed. J.'s train of thought is, however, more complex. To suit *his* purpose he starts by alluding to the fictitiousness of tragic characters: I suppose, he says, you might think I'm making all this up (634–5), like a tragedian, but in fact I am talking about contemporary Roman life, as the example of Pontia demonstrates. He then changes tack and allows the reality (*credamus* 643) of the mothers of tragedy, comparing them with mothers of real life – except that the Roman women, rather than emulating the mythical paradigms, behave in an even more appalling fashion, since their motivation is mere greed. Finally, towards the end of the passage J. uses mythical names as *exempla* in the conventional fashion (e.g. 655–6). For J., then, rather than tragic *exempla* corroborating the behaviour of real women, it is real life which proves the reality of the women of myth.

**627–33** For these lines as a structural and thematic lead-in to 634–7, see intro. 17.

**627 oderunt natos de paelice:** i.e. they hate sons born from their husband's first wife. Stepmotherly hatred was proverbial (cf. Eur. *Ion* 1329 'wives are always ill-disposed to their stepchildren'), and was more often than not motivated by jealousy of a stepson as his father's heir (Watson 1995: 147 n. 53). Here, the juxtaposition with the poisoning mothers of 629–42, who murder their sons for monetary motives, recalls in particular the *nouerca uenefica* of the Roman *declamatio*, whose hatred is invariably directed towards a male stepchild, e.g. Sen. *Controv.* 9.5, 6, Calp. *Decl.* 35; Watson 1995: 92–102. **natos de paelice:** the expression recalls Ov. *Met.* 2.468–9 *iam puer Arcas ... | ... fuerat de paelice natus*, and 4.422 *de paelice natus* (Bacchus, Semele's son by Jupiter), where the reference, as in many other uses of *paelex*, is to Juno, whose 'stepmotherly' hatred towards the offspring of her husband's mistresses is paradigmatic in Roman poetry of the *nouerca*'s hostility towards her *priuigni*: see Sen. *HF* 4–5 with Fitch, Watson 1995: 113–28. **paelice:** *paelex* ('rival') describes a woman who encroaches on another woman's marital relationship, whether a mistress, a second wife or rarely, as here, a first wife seen from the viewpoint of

the second (cf. Sen. *Med.* 495, Medea called the *paelex* of Creusa, Jason's bride).

**627–8** *nemo repugnet, | nemo uetet, iam iam priuignum occidere fas est*: with typically outrageous hyperbole (cf. Juv. 11.50–1), J. says that the killing of stepchildren is virtually considered *fas*: i.e. sanctioned by divine law. For similarly ironic play with ideas of *fas* and innocence, cf. Sen. *Thy.* 744–5 *hactenus si stat nefas, | pius est*, Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.8.

**628** *iam iam* 'at any moment now', describes an occurrence so imminent that it seems to have happened already (cf. Catull. 63.73 with Fordyce).

**629–33** J. warns fatherless boys with a large inheritance to beware: in these circumstances their own mothers are likely to make an attempt on their lives, as stepmothers have traditionally done. The underlying situation is unclear. *pupilli* were boys who had been left an inheritance by their deceased father, but were still under the age of puberty (14) when they could legally own property and make a will themselves. A *pupillus* thus died intestate, and under the rules of intestate succession his inheritance went to the nearest male relative: not until the time of Hadrian did mothers have a legal claim. What motivation would a mother have, then, for murdering her son? Bellandi 2006: 165 suggests that the law passed under Hadrian might have been operative prior to this in praetorian edicts, but even so, it only applied to women with the *ius trium liberorum*. It is easier to assume that the mother has been named in her husband's will as a substitute or 'pupillary' heir who would have a claim to the estate if the boy failed to reach puberty (Saller 1994: 177–8). Alternatively, the mother has been named as fiduciary heir, i.e. she inherits the estate but has a *fideicommissum* (Champlin 1991: 109–10, 121, Saller 1994: 176) to hand it over to the son when he reached a specified age: if the son died before then, presumably the mother, as heir, would keep the property for herself. In either of the last two scenarios, the mother would have a powerful motive for killing the son while still *impubes* – and his tender age is emphasised by the reference to the *adipata* (see 631n.) as well as the childish term *papas* (633).

**629** *uos quoque* 'you too'. *quoque*, Duff's suggestion on the basis of P's *equo*, is superior to the bland *ego* of the MSS, bringing out as it does the transition from a scenario where child murder was traditional to one where it certainly was not. *moneo*: pretentious didactic style; cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.353–4 with Gibson. *quibus amplior est res* 'who have wealth on the large side'. For *res* of wealth/property cf. Mart. 10.47.3 *res non parta labore, sed relicta*; OLD s.v. 1a. The size of the estate suggests the mother's motivation for murder.



**630 animas** ‘your life’. Cf. *OLD* s.v. 2. **nulli credite mensae** ‘don’t trust any dish [that your mother serves you]’.

**631 liuida:** active, ‘causing the body to become *liuidum*’: cf. Prop. 2.27.10 *pocula nigra*, Sil. 2.707 *deformata feret liuenti membra ueneno*. A dark-bluish discoloration of the body was regarded (erroneously: Horstmanshoff 1999: 41) as a sign of poison: cf. *Rhet. Her.* 2.5.8 *si tumore et liuore decoloratum corpus est mortui, significat eum ueneno necatum*, Dio Cass. 61.7.4, Suet. *Calig.* 1.2, Goetz 1908: 534. Such discoloration was associated with aconite (Wellmann, *RE* VII 117): here, given that the mothers are behaving like stepmothers and in view of *aconita* 639, J. may be thinking of Ov. *Met.* 1.147 *lurida terribiles miscent aconita nouercae*. **feruent** ‘burn’, alludes (*OLD* s.v. 1c) to the sensation of heat which poisons such as arsenic or aconite cause in the intestines (Gal. 11.688 Kühn; cf. *aestuosus* Hor. *Epod.* 3.18 of the burning indigestion produced by ‘poisonous’ garlic). For a similarly causative use of a verb of sensation cf. *Catal.* 13.17 *an ioci dolent?* (‘create pain’), Claud. *Rapt. Pros. praef.* 1.10 *languentem... metum*. **adipata:** sweet cakes which schoolboys ate for breakfast: cf. Mart. 14.223, where the boys buy them from the baker on the way to school; here the mother serves them at home.

**632 porrexerit:** *porrigere* is often used in passages describing poisoning: cf. 659n., Berrino 2001: 9.

**632–3 illa | quae peperit:** the periphrasis for *mater* underscores the unnaturalness of the crime which she is committing. Possibly a calque on the common tragic usage ἡ τεκοῦσα, anticipating mention of that genre immediately below (Bracciali Magnini 1982: 24).

**633 timidus:** the slave’s fear suggests that he is expecting the cup to be poisoned, underlining the likelihood of the scenario constructed by J. **prae-gustet:** the employment of slaves or freedmen (*praegustatores*: *CIL* VI 602, Kaufman 1932: 160) to pre-taste food or drink for poison was confined almost exclusively to the imperial house, children included; see e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 13.16. The present context, however, calls to mind the fantasy world of the declamation. At Sen. *Controv.* 9.6.19 a father claims *ipse omnes [filiae meae] praegustauit cibos* because he feared the wiles of his wife, the girl’s mother, who had already poisoned his other child, her stepson. **papas:** a child’s term for his *paedagogus* (cf. *CGL* 7.45b, Courtney *ad loc.*), a slave whose duties included accompanying the child to school and caring for his well-being, in addition to instructing him in social mores such as table manners (Bradley 1991: 52–5, Rawson 2003: 165–7, 214–15): in this last capacity he might well have been present at the child’s meals.

**634–40** J. anticipates an objection that he is permitting his Satire to overstep the limits of the genre (635n.) by inventing fictitious subject matter (*fingimus* 634) in the shape of homicidal mothers, in the elevated style of tragedy (636). If only this were fiction, he responds; but the example of Pontia shows that child murder has become a reality in contemporary Rome.

**634–7** have frequently been read as a programmatic statement that J. is adopting the so-called ‘high style’, while Braund 1992b has argued that, by using elevated diction of mundane subject matter, J. is claiming that satire has taken the place of epic (43) or, in the present case, of tragedy (47). But the lines must be taken in context. Far from entering the realm of tragedy, J. is *denying* that he is doing so, on the grounds that child-murderesses exist not only in tragedy but in real life (638–40) and so are a fit subject for his genre, dealing as it does with everyday reality. This denial J. satirically couches in high style (636–7 *Sophocleo...hiatu, bacchamur, Rutulis, Latino*), pointedly bringing the register down to earth in 638–40 in order to suggest by lexical means that the crimes hitherto associated with tragedy have invaded contemporary life. Cf. Grazia Battisti 1996: 80–1, Powell 1999, Morgan 2010: 345 n. 210.

**634 altum satura sumente coturnum:** i.e. J.’s Satire is taking on tragic themes and style. The wearing of the *coturnus* by a literary artist is synonymous with writing tragedy, and the metonymy is associated, as here, with movement from a lower to a higher register: cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.18.12–18, Mart. 12.94.3, Apul. *Met.* 10.2 *iam ergo lector optime, scito te tragoediam, non fabulam, legere et a socco ad cothurnum ascendere*. **altum...coturnum:** on this actors’ boot see 506n. *altum* conveys both the literal elevation of the shoe and the lofty tragic manner.

**635 scilicet** ‘no doubt’ [you think]. **finem...legemque priorum:** exceeding the rules and limitations established by J.’s satiric predecessors regarding the style and subject matter appropriate to the genre. For this use of *lex* cf. Hor. *Ars P.* 135 with Brink, Quint. *Inst.* 10.2.22, Juv. 7.102 and, for satire specifically, Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.1–2, further Keane 2006: 75–84. Both elevated style and mythical themes stand outside the *lex* of satire, which concerns itself with everyday reality in appropriately informal language: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.39–62, 1.10, Coffey 1976: 4–10, Facchini Tosi 1977.

**636 grande...carmen:** a tragedy; cf. Hor. *Ars P.* 80, Ov. *Rem. am.* 375 *grande sonant tragici*. **Sophocleo:** the Greek poet often serves to symbolise tragedy (e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 8.10 *Sophocleo...coturno*, Ov. *Am.* 1.15.15, Mart. 5.30.1), moreover tragedy in a notably elevated style (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.68); here *Sophocleo* additionally forms a contrast with the Roman allusions in the next line, underscoring the paradox that the *Roman* genre of satire takes

on the attributes of the *Greek* genre of tragedy. **bacchamur** ‘rant’ (*OLD* 3b: here unusually with an object), with reference to the belief that poets, especially in the grander genres, composed in a state of divine inspiration, often likened to Dionysiac/Bacchic possession (cf. Pl. *Ion* 533e–534a, *Ap.* 22b–c, Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.3–4), Dionysus being the god of poetry. See further N–H intro. to Hor. *Carm.* 2.19. **hiatu**: high-flown utterance, appropriate to tragedy; cf. Pers. 5.3 *fabula seu maesto ponatur hianda tragoedo*.

**637 montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino?** *Rutulis* and *Latino* continue the mock-elevation: *Latinus* is poetic (e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.29, 4.14.7, *Sil.* 6.603); *Rutulus* has an epic flavour, recalling not only Virgil (cf. 649–50n.) but also Silius (Romans called *Rutuli* six times in the *Punica*). *ignotum* suggests the claim, conventional among Roman poets, to be the first to bring a Greek genre to Italy, an idea sometimes expressed as here in topographical terms (e.g. Virg. *G.* 3.10–15, Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.21–5): J. would thus be the first Latin satirist to introduce tragic themes and language into the genre. Such innovation is normally a matter for self-congratulation, but in the mouth of the imaginary objector represents a criticism. **caeloque Latino**: a witty recontextualisation of Hor. *Carm.* 2.7.4 *Italoque caelo*. In the original the phrase refers to repatriation to the Italian homeland, here to a Greek incursion onto Italian soil.

**638 nos utinam uani**: sc. *essemus*. Cf. Prop. 3.13.59 *utinam patriae sim uanus haruspex* (on *uanus*, a correction, see Heyworth 2007: 354–5).

**638–9 sed clamat Pontia ‘feci, | confiteor’**: a confession confirming J.’s claim that he is not exaggerating, likely inspired by Mart. 9.15 *inscriptis tumulis septem scelerata uirorum* | ‘*se fecisse*’ *Chloe*. *quid pote simplicius?*, where see W–W for *feci* of committing a crime.

**638 Pontia**: the name of a *uenefica* in Mart. 2.34.6, 4.43.5 and 6.75.3–4. That Pontia was a real and notorious poisoner is suggested both by Martial’s description of a *matrona* who allows her children to starve to death as *mater, qua nec Pontia deterior* (2.34.6) and by circumstantial information in the Scholia to 638 which could not have been inferred from J.’s text, including the claim that she killed her sons following the death of her husband in order to get her sons’ money to give to her lover. See Baldwin 2004. For Pontia, aconite and poisons see additionally intro. 17–18.

**639 aconita**: a lethal neurotoxin derived from aconite, a genus of flowering plant belonging to the buttercup family. One of the classic poisons of Antiquity, known for its capacity to cause rapid death (Plin. *HN* 27.4, 10), it is still occasionally employed, as in the recent case of the British ‘Curry Poison Killer’ Lakhvir Singh, who gave her former lover

and his fiancée a curry laced with Indian aconite (*The Guardian*, 11 February 2010). **parauī**: for the verb of preparing poisons cf. *Dig.* 48.8.3.2 *uenenum... quod ad occidendum paratum est*.

**640 quae deprensa patent**: the antecedent of *quae* is the preceding clause (*pueris... parauī*), its subject of reference being inferred from the context: cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 764 *ita mihi renuntiatumst, quibus credo satis*, H-S 555. **‘facinus tamen ipsa peregi’**: the crime having been once uncovered (*quae... patent*), Pontia is perversely determined to claim the credit for it. As Housman noted (*ad loc.*, intro. 1), *tamen* goes with the following *peregi* to emphasise the fact that – unlikely though it might seem – Pontia committed filicide. *ipsa* (*OLD ipse* 4) emphasises that she prepared and administered the poison herself (cf. 632–3), rather than using a slave (cf. Apul. *Met.* 10.4–11) or employing a professional poisoner like Locusta. For the language of 640 cf. Sen. *Med.* 990–1, 1014 *iam perage coeptum facinus*.

**641 tune duos**: *occidisti* or the like is elided under the influence of powerful indignation: cf. Hofmann 1978: §51–2. **uipera**: a common term of abuse (Dickey 2002: 364; cf. Petron. 77.2 for its application to a woman), especially appropriate to the context, poisoning. Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 310, a stepmother is ‘no gentler than a viper’ to her stepchildren.

**642 ‘septem, si septem forte fuissent’**: her (hissing) answer reflects the language and context of Seneca’s *Medea* (cf. 643), *utinam superbae turba Tantalidos meo | exisset utero bisque septenos parens | natos tulissem! sterilis in poenas fui – | fratri patrique quod sat est, peperī duos* (954–7). For seven in the context of mass murder cf. Mart. 9.15 (638–9n.), 10.43.

**643 Colchide torua**: Medea, from Colchis in Asia Minor, who, in eponymous tragedies by Euripides, Seneca and Ovid, killed her sons by Jason to revenge herself upon him for deserting her for a new wife.

**644 Procne**: wife of Tereus, who killed her son Itys and served him up to her husband after the latter had raped her sister Philomela and cut out her tongue to prevent her from revealing the crime. The best-known account is Ov. *Met.* 6.424–674, but *tragicis* (643) suggests that J. had in mind Sophocles’ *Tereus*, or the Latin versions of Accius and Faustus (Juv. 7.12). Procne is often coupled with Medea in *exempla*: see Ov. *Am.* 2.14.29–34 with McKeown. **conor**: sc. *dicere* (*OLD* 2b).

**644–6 et illae | ...monstra... | ...nummos**: they too ventured atrocities, but the resemblance ends there (645–52). For *monstrum* ‘monstrous behaviour’ cf. 647, 15.121–2 *monstrum | audere*, Catull. 104.4, Sen. *Med.* 674–5 *maius parat | Medea monstrum*.

**645 suis... temporibus:** in implied contrast with ‘nowadays’, when mothers kill their children in cold blood.

**646 non propter nummos:** the comparison between Greek tragedy and contemporary Rome is somewhat specious, since Athenian women could not inherit or own property in their own right, and so had no motivation to kill their children ‘for money’.

**647–9 quotiens facit ira nocentes | hunc sexum et rabie ... feruntur | praecipites:** women, when victims of male treachery, were thought prone to excessive anger, resulting in madness (*rabie*) and criminal behaviour (cf. Eur. *Ion* 607–17, Ov. *Ars* 2.373–86, [Sen.] *HO* 233–4 *o quam cruentus feminas stimulat furor, | cum patuit una paelici et nuptae domus!*, 268–85n.): an idea grounded both in a belief that the female sex as a whole lacked self-control (*impotentia muliebris*: cf. Just 1989: 194–216, Vidén 1993) and in the conventional conjunction of anger and madness (cf. Sen. *Med.* 381–96, *De ira* 1.1.3–4, *Ep.* 18.14 *immodica ira gignit insaniam*). The killing of a child by its mother was regarded as so unnatural that in myth mothers who behave in this way (Hyg. *fab.* 239) are invariably given an excuse in the form of wrong suffered by them at the hands of a man.

**647 ira:** in Seneca’s *Medea*, in contrast to Euripides’, the *ira* of Medea at Jason’s treatment of her is very prominent, with 19 occurrences; cf. Val. Flacc. 8.444–9. At Ov. *Met.* 6.609, 623 and 627 *ira* is also used of Procne.

**647–8 nocentes | hunc sexum:** the combination of a collective noun with a plural (usually a verb or a participle, less commonly, as here, an adjective) is widespread in Latin: cf. H–S 436–9.

**648 rabie iecur incendente:** the liver was the seat of ‘the deeper emotions, stirred only by powerful stimuli’ (Onians 1951: 85). Anger, or as here, the resulting madness (*rabie*), has the effect of heating the liver; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.3–4 with N–H, *Sat* 1.9.66 *meum iecur urere bilis*, Juv. 1.45, Hagen (1961) 41–6.

**648–9 feruntur | praecipites, ut:** for the verb of women ‘carried away’ by madness cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.312, 2.379–80 *in ferrum flammisque ruit positoque decore | fertur ut Aonii cornibus icta dei*. Both verb and adjective (‘headlong’) lead neatly into the simile of tumbling rocks.

**649–50 ut saxa... | ...recedit** ‘like rocks torn from the heights, when the mountain caves in beneath them (lit. ‘from under which the mountain is dragged’) and its side recedes, as its slope hangs tottering’. The simile recalls Virg. *Aen.* 12.684–5 (of Turnus) *ac ueluti montis saxum de uertice praeceps | cum ruit auulsum uento* etc. The epic allusion not only suits the

mock-elevated context, but by evoking a simile referring to an epic hero (instead of comparing women possessed by *furor* to other female creatures, as is usual), J. hints once again at the propensity of women (*hunc sexum*) to behave in an unfeminine manner.

**651 non tulerim:** potential subjunctive, as often perfect with present force. Cf. Juv. 2.24. **computat** ‘counts her gains’.

**652 sana:** in contrast to the *rabies* which inspired tragic murderesses such as Medea (cf. Sen. *Med.* 123 *mente non sana feror*; 157, 174 etc.) and Procne (cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.595 *furiisque agitata doloris*).

**652–4** The transition from child-murder to husband-killing (655–61) is effected via a contrast between contemporary *matronae* and the supreme mythical *exemplum* of self-sacrificing wifely devotion, Alcestis (652–3n.). Alcestis was a popular paradigm, especially on grave inscriptions: cf. in particular the series for Pompilla set up by her husband, who had recovered from an illness after she prayed to die if his life was spared (*CLE* 1551; cf. Calder 1975: 81); see further Ov. *Tr.* 5.14.37, Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.192–3; Wood 1978, Parker 2003.

**652 spectant:** at a theatrical performance, probably of pantomime (the Alcestis story is among myths listed as essential knowledge for dancers at Lucian, *Salt.* 52), rather than the Euripidean drama or the Roman version by Accius: there is no clear evidence that tragedies were staged at this period; cf. Boyle 2006: 236–8 (a contrary view however in Jocelyn 1967: 48–50).

**652–3 subeuntem fata mariti | Alcestim:** Alcestis voluntarily sacrificed her life for her husband Admetus, who had been granted postponement of death if someone were prepared to die in his place.

**653–4 similis... | morte uiri cupiant animam seruare catellae:** if a similar choice to Alcestis’ were offered to a modern woman, it would be the husband, not the wife, who was sacrificed, and the beneficiary – bathetically – her lapdog, which means more to her than her spouse. Lapdogs were popular at Rome with adults and children (Toynbee 1973: 108–22, Brewer *et al.* 2001: illustr. 5.4), Maltese dogs being especially favoured (Busuttil 1969). Epitaphs attest to the affection in which they were held by their owners, an affection which attracts criticism (cf. Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 34, Citroni intro. to Mart. 1.109) if excessive or disproportionate, as here.

**655–61** J. passes from women who would let their husbands die if the choice arose to husband-murderers.

**655–6** *occurrent...tibi...| mane*: in the morning, perhaps en route to a *salutatio* (cf. 312–13), the addressee will run into murderous wives who have performed their deeds during the night, like the Danaids, the *nox Danaï* being proverbial (Stat. *Theb.* 4.133, Keuls 1974: 112).

**655** *multae...Belides atque Eriphylae*: many women like the Danaids and Eriphyle. For the comic hyperbole cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 549–51 (intro. 29), Eubul. fr.115.8–15 K–A. See also 627–61n. **Belides**: an Ovidian patronymic (e.g. Ov. *Ars* 1.74, *Tr.* 3.1.62) for the Danaids, the fifty daughters of Danaus, son of Belus. Forcibly married to their cousins, all but one murdered their bridegrooms on the wedding night and were subject thereafter to perpetual punishment in Hades. The story was popular in Greek tragedy, but it was the Roman poets who focused particularly on the murder aspect, an interest possibly engendered by a statue group erected in the portico of the temple of Apollo, dedicated in 28 BC: cf. Keuls 1974: 112, N–R intro. to Hor. *Carm.* 3.11. **Eriphylae**: Eriphyle accepted a necklace as a bribe to persuade her husband Amphiaras to join the Seven against Thebes, knowing it would lead to his death. She often serves as a negative moral *exemplum*: e.g. Pl. *Resp.* 590a, Prop. 3.13.57–8, N–R on Hor. *Carm.* 3.16.11–12, Muson. 4 (44 Lutz); 627–61n.

**656** *Clytemestram*: wife of Agamemnon, king of Mycenae, who, in collusion with her lover Aegisthus, murdered her spouse on his return from the Trojan war: the mythological example *par excellence* of a husband-slayer. **nullus non uicus habebit**: patent satiric exaggeration, though there were cases of women who allegedly killed their husbands by poison as the latter-day Clytemnestra does 659–61, e.g. Liv. 8.18, Val. Max. 2.5.3, Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.39, Kaufman 1932: 156–8, 627–61n. **uicus**: cf. 78n.

**657** *Tyndaris* ‘daughter of Tyndareus’, a term used of Clytemnestra by Ovid (e.g. *Ars* 2.408) and Seneca, *Ag.* 897; cf. also the mock-heroic Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.99–100 *at hunc liberta securi | diuisit medium, fortissima Tyndaridarum*. **bipennem**: the double-headed axe, associated with barbarians, was Clytemnestra’s traditional weapon, at least after Aeschylus (e.g. Soph. *El.* 99, Eur. *Hec.* 1279, *El.* 160, Ar. *Thesm.* 560 with Austin-Olson, Prag 1985: 88–90, Bernal 1997). The high-style noun (Urech 1999: 84–5) is comically deflated by the following *insulsam et fatuam*.

**658** *insulsam* ‘inept, lacking in sophistication’ and as such contrasted with *tenui* 659. **dextra laeuaque tenebat**: in literature and the majority of artistic representations, Clytemnestra holds the *bipennis* in her right hand to attack Agamemnon (e.g. Sen. *Ag.* 897 *armat bipenni Tyndaris dextram furens*, Prag 1985: 88–90). The unusual *dextra laeuaque* may reflect depictions

where she wields an axe in both hands, mostly however not against her husband (*LIMC* I 1 s.v. *Aigisthos* 6a and 11, Prag 1985: 59–60 with plate 37b, *LIMC* VI 2 s.v. *Klytaimestra* nos 19, 20). More important, the image of Clytemnestra hacking away with both hands accentuates her old-fashioned clumsiness and barbarity (Amazons sometimes use both hands to wield their axes, von Bothmer 1957: pl. LXXX nos. 3, 5b, LXXVII no. 1, LXXXI no. 3): nowadays methods of disposing of an unwanted husband are much more subtle (659).

**659 at nunc res agitur ... pulmone rubetae:** cf. Juv. 1.69–70 *matrona potens, quae molle Calenum | porrectura uiro miscet sitiente rubeta*. Toads were thought in Antiquity to be highly toxic (Plin. *HN* 11.280, Nic. *Alex.* 567–72, 578–82, Wellmann, *RE* VII 116–17): in fact, the European species are harmless to humans, in contrast to the highly poisonous dendrobatids of central and south America (Cogger and Zweifel 1998: 95–7). Toad’s lung is not mentioned as a poison elsewhere; according to Aelian, it is their blood that is toxic (*NA* 17.12). J. presumably chose the lung because of its small size (next n.). **tenui** = both ‘small’ and ‘subtle’, as opposed to the large, unwieldy axe of 657–8.

**660–1 et ferro ... | ... regis:** a mock-heroic, deliberately bathetic ending. Despite her sophisticated *uenena*, a wife will still resort, Clytemnestra-style (cf. *Atrides*) to cold steel, if her husband has fortified himself in advance against the effects of poison, as did Mithridates, who, unable to end his life by that means, was obliged to die by the sword: cf. App. *Mith.* 111, Dio Cass. 37.12–13, Gell. 17.16, Gal. 14.154–5 Kühn. **si prae-gustarit ... | ... medicamina regis:** i.e. if the husband has made himself immune to poison by using one of the various antidotes which circulated under Mithridates’ name, for which see Celsus, *Med.* 5.23.3, Plin. *HN* 25.5–7, Gal. 14.154–5 Kühn, Juv. 14.252–5. Mithridates was credited with the invention of antivenenes and had himself built up an immunity to poison by daily imbibing these (Plin. *HN* 25.6). See further Watson 1966: 35–44, Mayor 2010: 239–47. That the husband should take such precautionary measures suggests that he fears an attempt on his life by his wife (cf. *cautus*), thus reinforcing the point that husband-murderers were commonplace in Rome. **Atrides:** the identification of the husband as *Atrides* is layered with irony. The original Agamemnon was blind to his coming assassination (Hardie: 1997–8: 126), whereas his latter-day counterpart takes pharmacological precautions against murder – but ends up dead anyway (*sed tamen et ferro*)!

**661 ter uicti** can be explained in one of two ways: (1) an allusion to the three Mithridatic Wars, of 89–5, 83–1 and 73–63 BC respectively. In the



first, Mithridates was defeated by Sulla, in the third by Pompey. After the second, Murena, despite having suffered a series of defeats at the king's hands, held a triumph in Rome. Alternatively, (2) J. may have in mind the claim, preserved by Flor. 1.40.2 (cf. App. *Mith.* 112), that Mithridates was conquered in 'three great wars' by Sulla, Lucullus and Pompey. **regis:** Mithridates VI Eupator of Pontus, self-styled 'King of Kings' (Kotansky 1994: 196–201), Rome's most feared enemy in the first century BC.

## APPENDIX

---

*i nunc et dubita qua sorbeat aera sanna  
Tullia, quid dicat notae collectea Maurae  
Maura Pudicitiae ueterem cum praeterit aram.*  
(306–8)

These lines have been the subject of much discussion. As they stand, two senses are possible, depending on punctuation: (1) [inserting a comma after *Maura*] ‘... with what derisive gesture Tullia sniffs the air, what Maura, fellow nursling of the well-known Maura, says when she passes the ancient altar of Pudicitia’; (2) [with the comma after *Maurae*] ‘... with what derisive gesture Tullia sniffs the air, what the fellow nursling of the well-known Maura says when Maura passes the ancient altar of Pudicitia’. The difficulty with (1) is how to explain the phrase *notae collectea Maurae*. The second reading is more problematical. Does *collectea Maurae* refer to Tullia, or to a third person? More importantly, given that Tullia’s contemptuous sniff must be directed towards the goddess Pudicitia, it makes best sense if *dicat* is also a mark of derision, in which case it should be spoken by the person who is passing the altar (i.e. Maura), not another party.<sup>1</sup>

In some MSS the order of 307 and 308 is reversed (‘... with what derisive gesture Maura sniffs the air when she passes the ancient altar of Pudicitia, what Tullia, the fellow nursling of the well-known Maura, says’). But the verb *dicat* is now left hanging in the air and it is odd that Maura is not given her epithet *nota* till her second mention (Courtney). It is possible that Maura in the first line alludes to Tullia’s companion, in the second, to her notorious namesake, *nota* being added to distinguish the two. This, however, invites the question: what is the point of giving Tullia’s friend the same name as Tullia’s *collectea*, thus necessitating the rather clumsy explanatory *nota* and the repetition of the word Maura?

One solution, favoured by Courtney, is to excise line 307, since it is omitted in some MSS belonging to the group which is comparatively free from interpolation.<sup>2</sup> This has the advantage of getting rid of the problematic second Maura, but it also removes Tullia, leaving the plurals in 309 and 311 without a subject. Courtney’s explanation is that the Maura of 308 is a slave, in contrast to the wealthy women implied by *ponunt lecticas* 309: the plurals here and at 311 are, he claims, generalising and allude back to the subjects of 300–5. But the introduction of a person of humble status is intrusive (see discussion below), and in view of *in... uices equitant*

<sup>1</sup> For the same reason it is best not to take *Maurae* as dative, since the words should be said to or about Pudicitia, not to Tullia’s companion.

<sup>2</sup> See intro. 51.

(‘they take it in turns to ride each other’), it is best to imagine *two* female companions.

Of the readings listed above, the first (‘...with what derisive gesture Tullia sniffs the air, what Maura, fellow nursling of the well-known Maura, says when she passes the ancient altar of Pudicitia’) makes the greatest sense in terms of the logic of the passage as a whole. But difficulties remain. Who exactly is Maura, and why is she described as *notae collactea Maurae*?

Maura has often been assumed to be a slave, and this is certainly suggested by her name (‘The Mooress’).<sup>3</sup> The only evidence for Maura as the name of an upper-class woman is later than J.: for instance, the grandmother of Ausonius was Aemilia Corinthia Maura.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, aristocratic *matronae* in the Satire are normally given a name which clearly associates them with the upper classes, such as Eppia (112–13n.), Manilia, or Bibula.

There are, nonetheless, compelling reasons why the Maura who insults the altar, must, like her companion Tullia, be of high standing. The women’s desecration of the altar of Pudicitia only makes sense as a symbolic rejection of the virtue which it enshrines – the cardinal virtue of a married woman and of no relevance to a slave, to whom legal marriage was barred and who was subject to sexual exploitation on the part of her owner. Furthermore, both in this passage and throughout *Satire* 6 J.’s main targets are women of elevated status; on the rare occasions when he mentions (free) women of the lower classes this is always flagged (e.g. 72 *Aelia pauper, diuitibus* (585) is contrasted in 588 with *plebeium... fatum*).

The second problem to be addressed is the meaning of *notae collactea Maurae*. The force of *notae* is generally explained by appealing to *Satire* 10, where a Maura appears as a well-known *fellatrix*. In this passage (219–24), diseases attendant on old age are said to outnumber (among others) the lovers of Oppia, the patients killed in one autumn by doctor Themison and the men fellated by Maura in a single day (223–4 *quot longa uiros exorbeat uno | Maura die*).

Tullia’s aristocratic companion, then, is characterised as the *collactea* of a namesake famous for *fellatio*. The synonymous technical term *collactanei* (-ae) refers to those who as babies shared a wet-nurse, usually a well-born

<sup>3</sup> For Maura as a slave name cf. *CIL* vi 13401, 19731.

<sup>4</sup> The name Maura is not found in Raepsaet-Charlier 1987 and in *PIR*, while the six entries in *RE* for Maurus and two for Maura are all late. There are two examples of freeborn women called Maura: *CIL* vi 13933 Caesellia Maura and vi 12056 Antonia L f Maura (though her husband, Ti. Claudius Speratus, was probably a freedman). Kajanto 1965: 206 lists forty-five men and forty-one women with the cognomen: it is most common in Spain and Africa. Most of these are of uncertain status (i.e. they might be freeborn or freed). Interestingly, the *cognomen* of Ausonius’ grandmother was in origin a joking nickname given to her by her friends because of her dark complexion (Ausonius, *Parentalia* 5.3–4 *nomen huic iocularis datum, cute fusca quod olim | aequales inter Maura uocata fuit*): cf. n. 10 below.

child and the nurse's own (slave) child.<sup>5</sup> An upper-class Maura could be the *collectea* of a slave Maura, though given that Maura is a *cognomen*, this would involve the awkward assumption that the former had a name like Caesellia Maura (cf. *CIL* VI 13933) and that her slave *collectea* was coincidentally called Maura.<sup>6</sup>

But all this assumes that *nota Maura* was of servile status, perhaps an African slave prostitute<sup>7</sup> who, like Martial's (black) Chione,<sup>8</sup> was a famous *fellatrix*. In fact, however, the social class of Maura in *Satire* 10 is unclear from the context: of the other examples, the adulteress Oppia is aristocratic, while Themison is probably to be thought of as servile.<sup>9</sup> It is possible, therefore, that this Maura was a woman of high social status<sup>10</sup> notorious for *fellatio* who was well-known to J.'s readers but for whom independent evidence is lacking. The epithet *nota* might be significant here, since in the pejorative sense 'notorious' it is often applied to upper-class men or women known for their dubious morals, e.g. Catull. 40.6, Ascon. *In toga candida* fr. 28 Schoell, Juv. 2.10, 6.42 (*moechorum notissimus*), 9.25 *notior Aufidio moechus*, and especially Cic. *Cael.* 31 *cum Clodia, muliere non solum nobili uerum etiam nota*. This explanation would also solve the problem, discussed earlier, that Maura is not an obviously aristocratic name, since if there was such a person, then J. could invent a namesake of the same class. One problem remains, however, namely that there are no known cases of *collectanei* who were both aristocrats.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Bradley 1991: 149–55.

<sup>6</sup> The situation would be no different if Maura is a freedwoman: she could not have acquired her *collectea*'s name through manumission, since a *liberta* took the family name (*nomen*) of her patron, retaining her own slave name as a *cognomen*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Krenkel 2006: 216. Although *Maurus* is not an exact synonym for *Aethiops*, 'black African' (Thompson 1989: 50–1), Moors could be depicted as dark-skinned (Snowden 1970: 11–12).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Mart. 3.34 on the irony of her name ('Snow-white'). Maura might, like Chione, be a sobriquet. For Chione as *fellatrix* see Mart. 3.83, 87, 97.

<sup>9</sup> The famous Syrian doctor Themison, who lived under Augustus, may have been a free *peregrinus*, like most of the prominent doctors in Rome (Scarborough 1969: 110–11, 159). But J. is probably using the name as a generic term for a doctor, and *medici* who are satirised for incompetence tend to be of humble status (e.g. Martial 1.30.1 *chirurgus fuerat, nunc est uispillo Diaulus*, 8.74.1). The other characters in this passage are Basilus and Hirrus – both aristocratic names (see Courtney *ad loc.*), and Hamillus, a teacher who sodomizes his pupils: he may also be upper class, like his namesake in Martial 7.62, though most *grammatici* were freedmen, including the real-life corrupt teacher Palaemon (Suet. *De Gramm. et rhet.* 23.2 with Kaster).

<sup>10</sup> Possibly a woman of dark complexion who had been given the name as a nickname, like Ausonius' grandmother: n. 4 above.

<sup>11</sup> Bradley 1991: 150. The *Maurae* could also not be blood-sisters, since these shared a *nomen*, not a *cognomen* like Maura (e.g. Julia Agrippina, Julia Drusilla and Julia Livilla, the three daughters of Germanicus and Agrippina the Elder).

If *collactea* bears its literal and technical sense, there is no solution which is entirely without difficulties, though the last-mentioned comes closest. But perhaps all this is a red herring, diverting attention from the more interesting and important question of why J. should go to the trouble of inventing a woman called Maura who is described as having shared a wet-nurse with a notorious *fellatrix*, or – to put it another way – what the label *notae collactea Maurae* implies about Maura herself.

The question is best answered, it seems to us, by taking *collactea* in an obscene sense, suggesting that Maura shares the sexual proclivities of her infamous namesake. The phrase *collactea Maurae* is certainly capable of such an interpretation. Since the literal meaning of *fellare* is to suck a teat (Adams, *LSV* 131) and semen can be referred to as ‘milk’ (*emulso labra notata sero* Catull. 80.8), the meaning is surely that Maura, who sucks the same ‘milk’ as the notorious Maura, is likewise a *fellatrix*.<sup>12</sup>

The explanation just offered removes the main difficulty (cf. above with n. 11) standing in the way of the Maurae being an aristocratic pair. It has the additional advantage of providing a suitable lead-in to the lesbian activities subsequently engaged in by the two women, since it establishes Tullia’s companion Maura from the beginning as one with a predilection for sexual ‘depravity’.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Gniska 1968a: 52 comes close in his explanation of *collactea*, but without going into details. His interpretation of the lines as a whole, however, is unpersuasive: ‘with what derisive gesture Tullia sniffs the air, what she, fellow-nursling (i.e. of the same habits), says to the notorious Maura when she, a Maura (i.e. an unchaste woman) passes’.

<sup>13</sup> *fellatio* and lesbianism were regarded as depraved, normally the domain of lower-class prostitutes: cf. Krenkel 2006: 210–12, 215 (for *fellatio*).

## WORKS CITED

---

- Ackroyd, B. G. 1996. 'The Porticus Argonautarum and the Saepta', *Athenaeum* 34: 591-7
- Adams, J. N. 1972. 'Latin words for "woman" and "wife"', *Glotta* 50: 234-55
1981. 'Culus, clunes and their synonyms', *Glotta* 59: 231-64
- 1983a. 'Words for "prostitute" in Latin', *RhM* 126: 321-58
- 1983b. 'Martial 2.83', *CPh* 78: 311-15
1994. 'Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in classical Latin', *TPhS* 92: 103-78
2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*, Cambridge
- Allen, F. D. 1896 'On *os columnatum* (Plaut. *M.G.* 211) and ancient instruments of confinement', *HSPH* 7: 37-64
- Anderson, W. C. F. 1889. 'The meaning of "fulcrum" and "fulcri genius"', *CR* 3: 322-4
- Anderson, W. S. 1956. 'Juvenal 6: a problem in structure', *CPh* 51: 73-94 = Anderson 1982: 255-76
1962. 'The programs of Juvenal's later books', *CPh* 57: 145-60 = Anderson 1982: 277-92
1964. 'Anger in Juvenal and Seneca', *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 19: 127-96 = Anderson 1982: 293-361
1982. *Essays on Roman satire*, Princeton
- André, J. 1950. 'Les noms latins du chemin et de la rue', *REL* 28: 104-34
- Andrews, A. C. 1948. 'Oysters as a food in Greece and Rome', *CJ* 43: 299-303
- Appel, G. 1909. *De Romanorum precationibus*, Giessen
- Ashby, T. 1902. 'The classical topography of the Roman 'Campagna Part 1'', *PBSR* 1: 125-285
- Audollent, A. 1904. *Defixionum tabellae*, Paris
- Axelsson, B. 1939. 'A problem of genuineness in Juvenal', in ΔΡΑΓΜΑ Μ. P. Nilsson... *dedicatum* (Lund) 41-55
- Baldry, H. C. 1952. 'Who invented the Golden Age?', *CQ* 2: 83-92
- Baldwin, B. 2004. 'Pontia's pilates', *Petronian Society Newsletter* 34 [no pagination].
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1969. *Life and leisure in ancient Rome*, London
1979. *Romans and aliens*, London
- Baltes, M. 2000. 'Zur Nachwirkung des Satzes τὸ μακάριον καὶ ἀφθαρτον οὔτε αὐτὸ πράγματα ἔχει...', in M. Erler, ed. *Epikureismus in der späten Republik und der Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart) 93-108
- Barb, A. A. 1969. 'Lapis adamas - der Blutstein', in J. Bibauw, ed. *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, vol. 1 (Brussels) 66-82
- ... C. 1958. *Ornatus muliebris*, Turin

- Barrett, A. A. 1989. *Caligula*, London
- Bartman, E. 2001. 'Hair and the artifice of Roman temple adornment', *AJA* 105: 1–25
- Barton, T. 1994. *Ancient astrology*, London/New York
- Baumgart, J. 1936. *Die römischen Sklavennamen*, Diss. Breslau
- Beacham, R. C., 1999. *Spectacle entertainments of early imperial Rome*, New Haven
- Beard, M. 1990. 'Priesthood in the Roman Republic', in M. Beard and J. North, eds. *Pagan priests* (London) 17–48
- Beard, M., North, J. and Price, S. 1998. *Religions of Rome*, vol. 11, Cambridge
- Beare, W. 1964. *The Roman stage*, 3rd edn, London
- Becher, I. 1970. 'Der Isiskult in Rom – ein Kult der Halbwelt?', *ZÄS* 96: 81–90
- Becker, H. 1966. *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der antiken und mittelalterlichen Rohrblattinstrumente*, Hamburg
- Beerden, K. and Naerebout, F. G. 2011. 'Roman breastfeeding?', *CQ* 61: 761–6
- Bellandi, F. 1991. 'Mito e ideologia: età dell'oro e *mos maiorum* in Giovenale', *MD* 27: 89–128 = Bellandi 2003: 57–93
1995. *See under* Juvenal: editions, commentaries and translations
1998. 'Paradigmi mitici (ed elegiaci) e degradazione satirica: Eppia fra Elena e Arianna', *Maia* 50: 1–27 = Bellandi 2003: 125–56
2003. *Eros e matrimonio Romano: studi sulla satira vi di Giovenale*, Bologna
2006. 'Giovenale 6, 627–33 e il sc. Tertullianum', *RhM* 149: 158–67
- Berger, L. and Joos, M. 1971. *Das Augster Gladiatorenmosaik*, Augst
- Bernal, F. V. 1997. 'When painters execute a murderess: the representation of Clytemnestra on Attic vases', in A. O. Koloski-Ostrow and C. L. Lyons, eds. *Naked truths* (London/New York) 93–107
- Bernstein, F. 1998. *Ludi publici*, Stuttgart
- Berrino, N. F. 2001. 'Donne avvelenatrici in Giovenale', *InvLuc* 23: 7–13
- Berve, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, Munich
- Bickel, E. 1915. *Diatribae in Senecae philosophi fragmenta*, vol. 1: *Fragmenta de matrimonio*, Leipzig
- Bieber, M. 1959. 'Roman men in Greek himation', *PAPhS* 103: 374–417
- Bingham, S. 2003. 'Life on an island: a brief study of places of exile in the first century AD', in Deroux XI: 376–400
- Birt, T. 1907. *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst*, Leipzig
- Biville, F. 1996. "'Sophos!" uniuersi clamamus (Pétrone, 40.1)', in J.-M. André, J. Dangel and P. Demont, eds. *Les loisirs et l'héritage de la culture classique* (Brussels) 310–18
- Blech, M. 1982. *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin/New York
- Blümner, H. 1911. *Die römischen Privataltertümer*, Munich

- Boëls-Janssen, N. 1993. *La vie religieuse des matrones dans la Rome archaïque*, Rome
- Bonaria, M. 1959. 'Dinasti di pantomimi latini', *Maia* 11: 224-42
- Bond, R. P. 1979. 'Anti-feminism in Juvenal and Cato', in Deroux 1: 418-47
- Bonfante, L. 2006. 'Etruscan inscriptions and Etruscan religion', in N. Thomson de Grummond and E. Simon, eds. *The religion of the Etruscans* (Austin, TX) 9-26
- Bonner, S. 1969. *Roman declamation*, Liverpool
1977. *Education in ancient Rome*, London
- Borthwick, E. K. 1968. 'Notes on the Plutarch *De musica* and the Cheiron of Pherecrates', *Hermes* 96: 60-71
- Bouché-Leclercq, A. 1882. *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, vol. iv, Paris
1899. *L'astrologie grecque*, Paris
- Bowerman, H. C. 1913. *Roman sacrificial altars*, Diss. Bryn Mawr
- Boyancé, P. 1960-1. 'L'autre dans les mystères de Dionysos', *RPAA* 33: 107-27
- Boyle, A. J. 2006. *An introduction to Roman tragedy*, London/New York
- Bracciali Magnini, M. L. 1982. 'Grecismi dotti nelle satire di Giovenale', *A&R* 27: 11-25
- Bradley, K. R. 1986. 'Wet-nursing at Rome', in Rawson 1986b: 201-29
1987. *Slaves and masters in the Roman Empire*, New York/Oxford
1991. *Discovering the Roman family*, Oxford/New York
1994. *Slavery and society at Rome*, Cambridge
- Bradley, M. 2009. *Colour and meaning in ancient Rome*, Cambridge
- Braginton, M. V. 1944. 'Exile under the Roman emperors', *CJ* 39: 391-407
- Brain, P. 1986. *Galen on bloodletting*, Cambridge
- Bramble, J. C. 1974. *Persius and the programmatic satire*, Cambridge
- Brandenburg, H. 1966. *Studien zur Mitra*, Münster
- Braund, D. 1984. 'Berenice in Rome', *Historia* 33: 120-3
1994. *Georgia in antiquity*, Oxford
- Braund, S. H. 1988. *Beyond anger: a study of Juvenal's third book of Satires*, Cambridge
1990. 'Umbricius and the Frogs (Juvenal Sat. 3.44-5)', *CQ* 40: 502-6
- 1992a. 'Juvenal – misogynist or misogynist?', *JRS* 82: 71-86
- 1992b. *Roman verse satire*, Oxford
- Braund, S. M. 1996. *The Roman satirists and their masks*, London
- Braund, S. and Osgood, J. 2012. *A companion to Persius and Juvenal*, Malden, MA/Oxford
- Bremer, J. 1958. *Asexualisation*, Oslo
- Bremmer, J. N. 1987. 'The old women of ancient Greece', in J. Blok and P. Mason, eds. *Sexual asymmetry* (Amsterdam) 191-215
- Brewer, D., Clark, T. and Phillips, A. 2001. *Dogs in antiquity*, Warminster



- Briggs Jr., W. W. 1983. 'On Housman and polar errors', *AJP* 104: 268-77
- Briquel, D. 1992. 'Les femmes gladiateurs', *Ktema* 17: 47-53
- Broccia, G. 1984-91. 'Forma, formosus', in *Enciclopedia Vergiliana*, vol. II (Rome) 558-60
- Bromehead, C. N. 1952. 'What was murrine?', *Antiquity* 26: 65-70
- Brouwer, H. H. J. 1989. *Bona Dea: the sources and a description of the cult*, Leiden
- Brown, R. D. 1983. 'The litter: a satirical symbol in Juvenal and others', in Deroux III: 266-82
1994. 'The bed-wetters in Lucretius 4.1026', *HSPH* 96: 191-6
- Bruneau, P. 1965. 'Illustrations antiques du coq et de l'âne de Lucien', *BCH* 89: 349-57
- Brunet, S. 2004. 'Female and dwarf gladiators', *Mouseion* 4: 145-70
- Brunt, P. A. 1980. 'Evidence given under torture in the Principate', *ZRG* 97: 256-65
- Bücheler, F. 1899. 'Der echte oder unechte Juvenal?', *RhM* 54: 484-8
- Buckland, W. W. 1908. *The Roman law of slavery*, Cambridge
1963. *A text-book of Roman law*, 3rd edn rev. P. Stein, Cambridge
- Buddenhagen, F. 1918. *Περὶ γάμου*, Diss. Basel
- Burkert, W. 1987. *Ancient mystery cults*, Cambridge, MA/London
- Busuttil, J. 1969. 'The Maltese dog', *G&R* 16: 205-8
- Butcher, K. 2003. *Roman Syria and the Near East*, London
- Butrica, J. L. 1999. 'Using water "unchastely": Cicero *Pro Caelio* 34 again - addendum', *Phoenix* 53: 336
2006. 'Criso and ceueo', *Glotta* 82: 25-35
- Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic composition in Greek and Roman poetry*, Edinburgh
- Caldelli, M. L. 1993. *L'agon Capitolinus*, Rome
- Calder III, W. M. 1975. 'The Alkestis inscription from Odessos: IGBR 1<sup>2</sup> 222', *AJA* 79: 80-3
- Caldwell, L. 2008. 'Dido's *deductio*', *CPh* 103: 423-35
- Callahan, J. F. 1964. 'The figurative use of *emungere*', in C. Henderson Jr., ed. *Classical mediaeval and renaissance studies in honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, vol. I (Rome) 67-78
- Calza, G. 1947. 'Il santuario della Magna Mater a Ostia', *Atti della Pontifica Accademia Romana di archeologia, memorie* 4: 183-205
- Cameron, A. 1926. 'Notes on Juvenal', *CR* 40: 62-3
- Cameron, Alan, 1976. *Circus factions*, Oxford
- Canter, H. V. 1930. 'The figure ΑΔΥΝΑΤΟΝ', *AJP* 51: 32-41
- Carcopino, J. 1942. *Aspects mystiques de la Rome païenne*, Paris
- Carson, A. 1990. 'Putting her in her place: women, dirt and desire', in D. Halperin, J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin, eds. *Before sexuality* (Princeton) 135-69

- Carter, M. 1999. 'A *doctor secutorum* and the *retiarius* Draukos from Corinth', *ZPE* 126: 262–8
2008. '(Un)dressed to kill: viewing the *retiarius*', in J. Edmondson and A. Keith, eds. *Roman dress and the fabrics of Roman culture* (Toronto) 113–35
- Cèbe, J.-P. 1966. *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique*, Paris
- Cerutti, S. M. and Richardson, L., Jr. 1989. 'The *retiarius tunicatus* of Suetonius, Juvenal and Petronius', *AJP* 110: 589–94
- Champlin, E. 1991. *Final judgments: duty and emotion in Roman wills, 200 B.C.–A.D. 250*, Berkeley
- Charpin, E. 1978. 'La notion de solécisme chez les grammairiens latins', in J. Collart, ed. *Varron, grammaire antique et stylistique latine* (Paris) 211–16
- Chevallier, R. 1991. *L'artiste, le collectionneur et le faussaire*, Paris
- Clarke, J. 1996. 'Hypersexual black men in Augustan baths', in N. B. Kampen, ed. *Sexuality in ancient art* (Cambridge) 184–98
- Clarke, J. R. 1998. *Looking at lovemaking*, Berkeley
2003. *Roman sex 100 BC–AD 250*, New York
- Clay, D. 1998. 'The theory of the literary persona in Antiquity', *MD* 40: 9–40
- Coffey, M. 1976. *Roman satire*, New York/London
- Cogger, H. G. and Zweifel, R. G., eds. 1998. *Encyclopedia of reptiles and amphibians*, 2nd edn, Sydney/San Diego
- Cohen, S. T. 2008. 'Augustus, Julia and the development of exile *ad insulam*', *CQ* 58: 206–17
- Cokayne, K. 2003. *Experiencing old age in ancient Rome*, London/New York
- Coleman, K. M. 2000. 'Missio at Halicarnassus', *HSPH* 100: 487–500
2005. *Bonds of danger: communal life in the gladiatorial barracks of ancient Rome* (15th Todd memorial lecture), Sydney
- Coleman, R. 1977. *Vergil: Eclogues*, Cambridge
- Colin, J. 1952–3. 'Juvénal, les baladins et les rétiaires d'après le manuscrit d'Oxford', *AAT* 87: 315–86
- Corbeill, A. 1996. *Controlling laughter: political humor in the late Roman republic*, Princeton
1997. 'Dining deviants in Roman political invective', in Hallett and Skinner 1997: 99–128
2004. *Nature embodied: gesture in ancient Rome*, Princeton/Oxford
- Corbier, M. 2001. 'Child exposure and abandonment', in S. Dixon, ed. *Childhood, class and kin in the Roman world* (London/New York) 52–73
- Courtney, E. 1962. 'Vivat ludatque cinaedus', *Mnemosyne* 15: 262–6
1966. 'Juvenaliana', *BICS* 13: 38–43
1967. 'The transmission of Juvenal's text', *BICS* 14: 38–50

1974. 'Some thought-patterns in Juvenal', *Hermathena* 118: 15–21
1975. 'The interpolations in Juvenal', *BICS* 22: 147–62
1980. *See under* Juvenal: editions, commentaries and translations
1995. *Musa lapidaria: a selection of Latin verse inscriptions*, Atlanta
- Cowan, R. 2008. 'Nothing to do with Phaedra? Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae* 497–501', *CQ* 58: 315–20
- Cracco Ruggini, L. 1989. 'Juridical status and historical role of women in Roman patriarchal society', *Klio* 71: 604–19
- Cramer, F. H. 1954. *Astrology in Roman law and politics*, Philadelphia
- Crook, J. A. 1951. 'Titus and Berenice', *AJP* 72: 162–75
1955. *Consilium principis*, Cambridge
1967. *Law and life of Rome*, London
1976. 'Sponsione prouocare: its place in Roman litigation', *JRS* 66: 132–8
- Crowther, N. B. 1977. 'Weightlifting in antiquity', *G&R* 24: 111–20
1980. 'Nudity and morality: athletics in Italy', *CJ* 76: 119–23
- D'Agostini, V. 1969. 'Sugli antichi Saturnali', *RSC* 17: 180–7
- Dauge, Y. A. 1981. *Le barbare*, Brussels
- Davies, G. 2010. 'Viewer, I married him: marriage and freedwomen in Rome', in Larsson Lovén and Strömberg 2010: 184–203
- Davies, M. 1980. 'The eyes of love and the hunting-net in Ibycus 28 P.', *Maia* 32: 255–7
- De Carolis, E. 2001. *Gods and heroes in Pompeii*, tr. L.-A. Touchette, Rome
- De Decker, J. 1913. *Juvenalis declamans*, Gand
- De Meo, C. 1986. *Lingue tecniche del latino*, 2nd edn, Bologna
- Dean-Jones, L. 1994. *Women's bodies in classical Greek science*, Oxford
- Demand, N. 1994. *Birth, death and motherhood in classical Greece*, Baltimore/London
- Deroux, C., ed. 1979/1983/1989/2003/2007. *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history* 1, III, v, XI, XIV, Brussels
- Dickey, E. 2002. *Latin forms of address*, Oxford
- Dickie, M. W. 1985. 'The speech of Numanus Remulus', *PLLS* 5: 165–221
1993. 'Παλαιστρίτης/Palaestrita', *Nikephoros* 6: 105–51
- Diercks, G., ed. 1996. *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Epistularium*, vol. III C, Turnhout
- Dierichs, A. 1999. 'Klingendes Kleinod. Ein unbekanntes Tintinnabulum in Dänemark', *AW* 30.2: 145–9
- Dieterich, A. 1910. *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 2nd edn, Berlin
- Dingwall, E. J. 1925. *Male infibulation*, London
- Dionisotti, C. 2007. 'Ecce', *BICS* 50: 75–91
- Dixon, S. 1988. *The Roman mother*, London/Sydney
1991. 'The sentimental ideal of the Roman family', in Rawson 1991: 99–113
1992. *The Roman family*, Baltimore/London

2001. *Reading Roman women*, London
2007. *Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi*, London/New York
- Dölger, F. J. 1936. 'Nilwasser und Taufwasser', *Antike und Christentum* 5: 153–87
1940. 'Das Ei im Heilzauber', *Antike und Christentum* 6.1: 57–60
- Dorcey, P. F. 1989. 'The role of women in the cult of Silvanus', *Numen* 36: 143–55
1992. *The cult of Silvanus*, Leiden
- Dorfman, R. I. and Shipley, R. A. 1956. *Androgens*, New York/London
- Draeger, A. 1878, 1881. *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*, vols. 1–II, Leipzig
- Drogula, F. K. 2011. 'Controlling travel: deportation, islands and the regulation of senatorial mobility in the Augustan principate', *CQ* 61: 230–66
- Dubois-Pelerin, E. 2008. *Le luxe privé à Rome et en Italie au 1<sup>er</sup> siècle après J.-C.*, Naples
- Dubuisson, M. 1983. 'Les *opici*: Osques, Occidentaux ou Barbares?', *Latomus* 42: 522–45
1991. 'Graecus, Graeculus, Graecari', in S. Said, ed. 'ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ (Leiden) 315–35
- Dunbabin, K. M. D. 1993. 'Wine and water at the Roman *convivium*', *JRA* 6: 116–41
1995. 'Scenes from the Roman *convivium*', in O. Murray and M. Tecusan, eds. *In vino ueritas* (Rome) 252–65
2003. *The Roman banquet*, Cambridge
- Dunkle, R. 2008. *Gladiators*, Harlow
- Durry, M. 1969. 'Cosmetae (Juvenal vi, 477)', in J. Bibauw, ed. *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, vol. 1 (Brussels) 329–34
- Earl, D. C. 1967. *The moral and political tradition of Rome*, London
- Eck, W. 1984. 'Senatorial self-representation: developments in the Augustan period', in F. Millar and E. Segal, eds. *Caesar Augustus: seven aspects* (Oxford) 129–67
- Eden, P. T. 1985. 'Juvenalia', *Mnemosyne* 38: 334–52
- Edmunds, L. 1992. 'Lucilius 730M: a scale of power', *HSPH* 94: 217–25
- Edwards, C. 1993. *The politics of immorality in ancient Rome*, Cambridge
1997. 'Unspeakable professions: public performance and prostitution in ancient Rome', in Hallett and Skinner 1997: 66–95
- Edwards, M. J. 1991. 'A quotation of Sappho in Juvenal "Satire" 6', *Phoenix* 45: 255–7
- Eitrem, S. 1915. *Opferritus und Voropfer*, Kristiana
- Engel, D. M. 2003. 'Women's role in the home and state: Stoic theory reconsidered', *HSPH* 101: 267–88
- Étienne, R. 1974. 'Recherches sur l'ergastule', in *Actes du colloque 1972 sur l'esclavage*, vol. II (Paris) 249–66

- Evans-Grubb, J. 1993. "Marriage more shameful than adultery": slave-mistress relationships, "mixed marriages" and late Roman law', *Phoenix* 47: 125-54
- Eyben, E. 1972. 'Antiquity's view of puberty', *Latomus* 31: 677-97
- 1980-1. 'Family planning in Graeco-Roman antiquity', *AncSoc* 11-12: 5-82
- Facchini Tosi, C. 1977. 'Giovenale (6, 634-644) di fronte a Persio (5, 1-20)', *Prometheus* 3: 241-54
- Fagan, G. G. 1999. *Bathing in public in the Roman world*, Ann Arbor
- Fantham, E. 1986. 'ΖΗΛΟΥΣΙΑ', *Phoenix* 40: 45-57
1989. 'Mime: the missing link in Roman literary history', *CW* 82: 153-63
1991. 'Stuprum', *EMC* 10: 267-91
- Faraone, C. A. 1999. *Ancient Greek love magic*, Cambridge, MA
- Fear, A. T. 1991. 'The dancing girls of Cadiz', *G&R* 38: 75-9
- Feldman, L. H. 1993. *Jew and Gentile in the ancient world*, Princeton
- Ferguson, J. 1987. *A prosopography to the poems of Juvenal*, Brussels
1998. *See under* Juvenal: editions, commentaries and translations
- Fishwick, D. 1967. 'Hastiferi', *JRS* 57: 142-60
- Fitzgibbon, J. C. 1976. 'Ergastula', *EMC* 20: 55-9
- Flemming, R. 1999. 'Quae corpore quaestum facit: the sexual economy of female prostitution in the Roman Empire', *JRS* 89: 38-61
- Flory, M. B. 1997 (1988) 'The meaning of *Augusta* in the Julio-Claudian period', *AJAH* 13: 113-38
- Flower, H. I. 1996. *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture*, Oxford
- Forbes, R. J. 1993. *Studies in ancient technology*, vol. II, 3rd edn, Leiden
- Fortson, B. W. IVth 2008. 'Bleary eyes and ladles of clay', *Glotta* 84: 52-71
- Fraenkel, E. 1932. 'Selbstmordwege', *Philologus* 87: 470-3 = *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1964) 465-7
- Franklin, J. L., Jr. 1987. 'Pantomimists at Pompeii', *AJP* 108: 95-107
- Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford
- Freudenburg, K. 2001. *Satires of Rome*, Cambridge
- Friedländer, L. 1913. *Roman life and manners*, vol. IV, tr. L. Magnus *et al.*, London
- Frier, B. W. 1980. *Landlords and tenants in imperial Rome*, Princeton
1994. 'Natural fertility and family limitation in Roman marriage', *CPh* 89: 318-33
- Gaertner, J. F. 2007. 'Tum und tunc in der augusteischen Dichtersprache', *RhM* 150: 211-24
- Gardner, J. F. 1986. *Women in Roman law and society*, London/Sydney
- Garland, R. 1995. *The eye of the beholder: deformity and disability in the Graeco-Roman world*, London
- Garnsey, P. 1970. *Social status and legal privilege in the Roman Empire*, Oxford

- Garrido-Hory, M. 1997. '“Puer” et “minister” chez Martial et Juvénal', in M. Moggi and G. Cordiano, eds. *Schiavi e dipendenti nell'ambito dell' “oikos” e della “familia”* (Pisa) 307–27
- Gatz, B. 1967. *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*, Hildesheim
- Gerber, D. E. 1978. 'The female breast in Greek erotic literature', *Arethusa* 11: 203–12
- Giangrande, G. 1965. 'Juvenalian emendations and interpretations', *Eranos* 63: 26–41
- Gibson, R. K. 2003. *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 3*, Cambridge
- Gilleland, M. 1980. 'Female speech in Greek and Latin', *AJP* 101: 180–3
- Ginsburg, J. 2006. *Representing Agrippina*, Oxford/New York
- Gnilka, C. 1968a. 'Maura Maurae collectea. Zu Juv. Sat. 6.306–8', *RFIC* 96: 47–54
- 1968b. '“Scholiastenweisheit” und moderne Exegese. Zu Juvenal Sat. 6.231ff. und 247ff.', *WS* 2: 193–205
- Goetz, K. E. 1908. 'Waren die Römer blaublind?', *ALL* 15: 527–47
- Gold, B. K. 1994. *Humor in Juvenal's sixth satire: is it funny?*, in S. Jäkel and A. Timonen, eds. *Laughter down the centuries*, vol. 1 (Turku) 95–111
1998. '“The house I live in is not my own”: women's bodies in Juvenal's Satires', *Arethusa* 31: 369–86
2012. 'Juvenal: the idea of the book', in Braund and Osgood 2012: 97–112
- Goldenberg, R. 1979. 'The Jewish sabbath in the Roman world', *ANRW* 11 19.1.414–47
- Goldman, H. 1943. 'Two terracotta figurines from Tarsus', *AJA* 47: 22–34
- Golvin, J.-C. and Landes, C. 1990. *Amphithéâtres et gladiateurs*, Paris
- Goodenough, E. R. 1958. *Jewish symbols in the Greco-Roman period*, vol. VII, New York
- Goold, G. P. 1977. *Manilius: Astronomica*, Cambridge, MA
- Gourévitch, D. 1987. 'La mort de la femme en couches et dans les suites de couches', in F. Hinard, ed. *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain* (Caen) 187–93
- Gow, A. S. F. 1956. 'Phanias', *CQ* 6: 231–6
- Gowers, E. 1995. 'The anatomy of Rome from Capitol to Cloaca', *JRS* 85: 23–32
- Gradel, I. 2002. *Emperor worship and Roman religion*, Oxford
- Graillot, H. 1912. *Le culte de Cybèle mère des dieux à Rome et dans l'empire romain*, Paris
- Grant, M. 1975. *Erotic art in Pompeii*, London
- Gray, L. H. 1912. s.v. 'eunuch', in *Hastings' encyclopaedia of religion and ethics*, vol. v (Edinburgh) 579–84

- Grazia Battisti, D. 1996. *La retorica della misoginia: la satira sesta di Giovenale*, Venosa
- Grazzini, S. 1993. 'Curuca: su una lezione controversa in Iuv. 6.276', *Maia* 45: 161–76
- Grenier, J.-C. 1977. *Anubis alexandrin et romain*, Leiden
- Griffin, M. 1986. 'Philosophy, Cato, and Roman suicide 1–11', *G&R* 33: 64–77, 192–202
- Griffith, J. G. 1963. 'The survival of the longer of the so-called "Oxford" fragments of Juvenal's sixth satire', *Hermes* 91: 104–14
1971. 'On synecdoche of the verb *ponere* in Juvenal', *SO* 46: 135–41
- Griffith, M. 2006. 'Horsepower and donkeywork', *CPh* 101: 185–246
- Griffith, R. D. 1996. 'The eyes of Clodia Metelli', *Latomus* 55: 381–3
- Griffiths, J. G. 1961. 'The death of Cleopatra VII', *JE4* 47: 113–18
- Grillet, B. 1975. *Les femmes et les fards dans l'antiquité grecque*, Lyon
- Grimm-Samuel, V. 1991. 'On the mushroom that deified the Emperor Claudius', *CQ* 41: 178–82
- Grisé, Y. 1982. *Le suicide dans la Rome antique*, Montreal/Paris
- Grmek, M. D. and Gourévitch, D. 1998. *Les malades dans l'art antique*, Paris
- Gunderson, E. 1996. 'The ideology of the arena', *CLAnt* 15: 113–51
- Guyot, P. 1980. *Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Stuttgart
- Haack, M.-L. 2002. 'Haruspices publics et privés', *REA* 104: 111–33
- Haffter, H. 1956. 'Superbia innenpolitisch', *SIFC* 27–8: 135–41
- Hagen, H. 1961. *Die physiologische und psychologische Bedeutung der Leber in der Antike*, Diss. Bonn
- Hales, S. 2003. *The Roman house and social identity*, Cambridge
- Halleran, C. 2012. *Shopping in ancient Rome*, Oxford
- Hallett, J. P. 1984. *Fathers and daughters in Roman society*, Princeton
- Hallett, J. P. and Skinner, M. B., eds. 1997. *Roman sexualities*, Princeton
- Hardie, A. 1997–8. 'Juvenal, Domitian, and the accession of Hadrian (Satire 4)', *BICS* 42: 117–44
- Harris, C. R. S. 1973. *The heart and the vascular system in ancient Greek medicine*, Oxford
- Harris, W. V. 1980. 'Towards a study of the Roman slave trade', *MAAR* 36: 117–40
1994. 'Child-exposure in the Roman Empire', *JRS* 84: 1–22
2001. *Restraining rage*, Cambridge, MA/London
2003. 'The rage of women', *YCLS* 32: 121–43
- Häussler, R. 1968. *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter*, Darmstadt
- Hawley, R. 1999. 'Practising what you preach', in Pomeroy 1999: 116–27
- Heck, E. 1970. '*Iuuenta, iuventas, iuventus*', in M. von Albrecht and E. Heck, eds. *Silvae* (Tübingen) 65–74
- Heckenbach, J. 1911. *De nuditate sacra*, Giessen

- Hellegouarc'h, J. 1964. *Le monosyllabe dans l'hexamètre latin*, Paris  
 1972. *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république*, Paris
- Hemelrijk, E. A. 1999. *Matrona docta: educated women in the Roman élite*, London/New York
- Henderson, J. 1991. *The maculate muse: obscene language in Attic comedy*, 2nd edn, Oxford/New York
- Hendry, M. 1995–6. 'Juvenalia', *MCr* 30–31: 253–66  
 1997. 'Interpolating an Isthmus: Juvenal 6.294–7', *CQ* 47: 323–7
- Hengel, M. 1977. *Crucifixion*, London
- Henrichs, A. 1978. 'Greek maenadism from Olympias to Messalina', *HSPH* 82: 121–60
- Herrmann, L. 1940. 'Juvenaliana', *REA* 42: 448–52
- Herrmann, M. 1992. 'Zur Frau als Zuschauerin bei Wettkämpfen in römischer Zeit', *Nikephoros* 5: 85–102
- Hersch, K. 2010a. *The Roman wedding*, Cambridge  
 2010b. 'The woolworker bride', in Larsson Lovén and Strömberg 2010: 122–35
- Herter, H. 1932. *De Priapo*, Giessen  
 2003. 'The sociology of prostitution in antiquity', tr. L. DeLong, in M. Golden and P. Toohey, eds. *Sex and difference in ancient Greece and Rome* (Edinburgh) 57–113
- Heyob, S. K. 1975. *The cult of Isis among women in the Graeco-Roman world*, Leiden
- Heyworth, S. J. 2007. *Cynthia: a companion to the text of Propertius*, Oxford
- Higgins, R. A. 1980. *Greek and Roman jewellery*, London
- Hightet, G. 1954. *Juvenal the satirist*, Oxford  
 1974. 'Masks and faces in satire', *Hermes* 102: 321–37
- Hild, J.-A. 1885. 'Les Juifs à Rome devant l'opinion et dans la littérature III', *REJ* 11: 161–94
- Hill, D. 1973. 'The Thessalian trick', *RhM* 116: 221–38
- Hill, P. V. 1989. *The monuments of ancient Rome as coin types*, London
- Hintze, F. 1964. 'The Latin inscription from Musawwarat es Sufra', *Kush* 12: 296–8
- Hirschfeld, O. 1905. *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, 2nd edn, Berlin
- Hofmann J. B. 1978. *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, 4th edn, Heidelberg
- Holland, L. A. 1961. *Janus and the bridge*, Rome
- Hooley, D. 2007. *Roman Satire*, Oxford
- Hopkins, K. 1965a. 'The age of Roman girls at marriage', *Population Studies* 18: 309–27  
 1965b. 'Contraception in the Roman Empire', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 8: 124–51



1978. *Conquerors and slaves*, Cambridge
1983. *Death and renewal*, Cambridge
- Horsfall, N. 1979. 'Doctus sermonis utriusque linguae?', *EMC* 23: 79–95
1985. 'CIL.v1 37965 = CLE 1988 (epitaph of Allia Potestas): a commentary', *ZPE* 61: 251–72
- Horster, M. 2007. 'Living on religion: professionals and personnel', in J. Rüpke, ed. *A companion to Roman religion* (Malden/Oxford) 331–41
- Horstmanshoff, H. J. F. 1999. 'Ancient medicine between hope and fear: medicament, magic and poison in the Roman Empire', *European Review* 7: 37–51
- Huebner, S. R. 2007. '"Brother-sister" marriage in Roman Egypt', *JRS* 97: 21–49
- Humphrey, J. 1986. *Roman circuses*, London
- Hurley, D. W. 2001. *Suetonius: Diuus Claudius*, Cambridge
- Iddeng, J. 2000. 'Juvenal, satire and the persona theory: some critical remarks', *SO* 75: 107–29
- Imholtz, A. A. 1977. 'Fungi and place-names: the origin of *boletus*', *AJP* 98: 71–6
- Jaeger, W. 1946. *Paideia*, Vol. 1, 3rd English edn, tr. G. Highet, Oxford
- Jameson, M. 1993. 'The asexuality of Dionysus', in T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone, eds. *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca) 44–64
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1967. *The tragedies of Ennius*, Cambridge
1983. 'Lucretius 4.1263–77', *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* 17: 53–8
- Johnson, W. R. 1996. 'Male victimology in Juvenal 6', *Ramus* 25: 170–86
- Jones, A. H. M. 1972. *The criminal courts of the Roman Republic and Principate*, Oxford
- Jones, F. 2007a. *Juvenal and the satiric genre*, London
- 2007b. 'Juvenal and the satiric hexameter', in Deroux XIV: 348–64
- Jones, P. 2000. 'Juvenal, the Niphates, and Trajan's column', *HSPH* 100: 477–86
- Jordan, R. 1974. *Berenice*, London
- Jory, E. J. 1981. 'The literary evidence for the beginnings of imperial pantomime', *BICS* 28: 147–61
1996. 'The drama of the dance', in W. J. Slater, ed. *Roman theater and society* (Ann Arbor) 1–27
2001. 'Some cases of mistaken identity? Pantomime masks and their context', *BICS* 45: 1–20
- Joshel, S. R. 1997. 'Female desire and the discourse of empire: Tacitus's Messalina', in Hallet and Skinner 1997: 221–54
- Junkelmann, M. 2008. *Gladiatoren: Das Spiel mit dem Tod*, Mainz
- Just, R. 1989. *Women in Athenian law and life*, London/New York
- Kajanto, I. 1965. *The Latin cognomina*, Helsinki

1969. 'On divorce among the common people of Rome', *REL* 47 (2): 99–113
1981. 'Fortuna', *ANRW* xvii 1.502–58
- Kajava, M. 1989. 'Cornelia Africana f. Gracchorum', *Arctos* 23: 119–31
- Kampen, N. 1981. *Image and status: Roman working women in Ostia*, Berlin
- Kapparis, K. 2002. *Abortion in the ancient world*, London
- Kaster, R. A. 2005. *Emotion, restraint, and community in ancient Rome*, Oxford
- Kaufman, D. B. 1932. 'Poisons and poisoning among the Romans', *CPh* 27: 156–67
- Keane, C. 2002. 'Juvenal's cave-woman and the programmatics of satire', *CB* 78: 5–20
2006. *Figuring genre in Roman satire*, Oxford/New York
2010. 'Persona and satiric career in Juvenal', in P. Hardie and H. Moore, eds., *Classical literary careers and their reception* (Cambridge) 105–17
- Kearns, E. 1994. 'Cakes in Greek sacrifice regulations', in R. Hägg, ed. *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm) 65–70
- Keegan, P. 2008. 'Turia, Lepidus and Rome's epigraphic environment', *Studia humaniora Tartuensia* 9: 1–7
- Keller, O. 1909. *Die antike Tierwelt*, vol. 1, Leipzig
- Kenney, E. J. 1962. 'The first satire of Juvenal', *PCPhS* 8: 29–40
1963. 'Juvenal: satirist or rhetorician?', *Latomus* 22: 704–20
2012. 'Satiric textures: style, meter and rhetoric', in Braund and Osgood 2012: 113–36
- Keuls, E. 1974. *The water carriers in Hades*, Amsterdam
- King, C. W. 1870. *The natural history of gems or semi-precious stones*, London
- Kleberg, T. 1957. *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antiquité romaine*, Uppsala
- Kleiner, D. E. 1987. 'Women and family life on funerary altars', *Latomus* 46: 545–54
- Knoche, U. 1938. 'Ein Wort zur Echtheitskritik', *Philologus* 93: 196–217
- Knox, A. D. and Headlam, W. 1922. *Herodas*, Cambridge
- Koch-Harnack, G. 1983. *Knabenliebe und Tiergeschenke*, Berlin
- Köchling, J. 1914. *De coronarum apud antiquos ui atque usu*, Giessen
- Koets, P. J. 1929. Δεισιδαιμονία, Purmerend
- Köves-Zulauf, T. 1990. *Römische Geburtsriten*, Munich
- Kotansky, R. 1994. *Greek magical amulets. Part 1*, Opladen
- Krebs, J. Ph. and Schmalz, J. H. 1905–7. *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache*, 7th edn, Basel
- Krenkel, W. 1979. 'Pueri meritorii', *WZRostock* 28: 179–89
1987. 'Figurae Veneris II', *WZRostock* 36: 49–56
2006. *Naturalia non turpia: sex and gender in ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. W. Bernard and C. Reitz, Hildesheim

- Kroll, W. 1914–16. 'Die Grabschrift der Allia Potestas', *Philologus* 27: 274–88
1925. *Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht*, 3rd edn, Berlin
- Kurke, L. 1991. *The traffic in praise: Pindar and the poetics of social economy*, Ithaca
- Kyle, D. G. 1998. *Spectacles of death in ancient Rome*, London
- La Penna, A. 1997. 'Giovenale 6.165: per la storia di uno stilema virgiliano', *SIFC* 15: 250–3
- Lada-Richards, I. 2007. *Silent eloquence: Lucian and pantomime dancing*, London
- Landels, J. G. 1999. *Music in ancient Greece and Rome*, London/New York
- Langlands, R. 2006. *Sexual morality in ancient Rome*, Cambridge
- Larsson Lovén, L. 1998. 'Lanam fecit: woolworking and female virtue', in L. Larsson Lovén and A. Strömberg, eds. *Aspects of women in antiquity* (Jonsered) 85–95
2010. 'Conjugal concordia', in Larsson Lovén and Strömberg 2010: 204–20
- Larsson Lovén, L. and Strömberg, A. 2010. *Ancient marriage in myth and reality*, Cambridge
- Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich
- Lattimore, R. 1962. *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs*, Urbana, IL
- Laudizi, G. 1982. *See under* Juvenal: editions, commentaries and translations
- Lawler, L. B. 1964. *The dance in ancient Greece*, London
- Le Bonniec, H. 1958. *Le culte de Cérès à Rome*, Paris
- Leary, T. J. 1996. *Martial book xiv: the Apophoreta*, London
2001. *Martial book XIII: the Xenia*, London
- Lease, E. B. 1898. 'I nunc and i with another imperative', *AJP* 19: 59–69
- Lee, H. M. 1988. 'SIG<sup>3</sup> 802: did women compete against men in Greek athletic festivals?', *Nikephoros* 1: 103–17
- Lelis, A. A., Percy, W. A. and Verstraete, B. C. 2003. *The age of marriage in ancient Rome*, Lewiston
- Lentano, M. 1995. 'Le matrone e il simulacro: Giovenale 6.303–10', *BStud-Lat* 25: 74–89
- Leo, F. 1909. 'Doppelfassungen bei Iuvenal', *Hermes* 44: 600–17
- Leon, E. F. 1948. 'The imbecillitas of the emperor Claudius', *TAPhA* 79: 79–86
- Leon, H. J. 1995. *The Jews of ancient Rome*, 2nd edn, Peabody, MA
- Leppin, H. 1992. *Histrionen*, Bonn
- Leumann, M. 1975. 'Zu den Verwendungen des lat. Praeverbs com-', *MH* 32: 91–8
- Levick, B. 1983. 'The senatus consultum from Larinum', *JRS* 73: 97–115
1990. *Claudius*, London

- Lewis, S. 1996. *News and society in the Greek polis*, London
- Lewy, H. 1929. 'Philologisches aus dem Talmud', *Philologus* 84: 377-98
- Lieberman, S. 1953. *Contact between Rome and China*, Diss. Columbia
- Lightman, M. and Zeisel, W. 1977. 'Uniuira', *Church History* 46: 19-32
- Lintott, A. W. 1972. 'Imperial expansion and moral decline in the Roman Republic', *Historia* 21: 626-38
- Loewental, A. I. and Harden, D. B. 1949. 'Vasa murrina', *JRS* 39: 31-7
- Löfstedt, E. 1933. *Syntactica*, vol. II, Lund
- 1936a. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, Oxford/Uppsala/Leipzig
- 1936b. *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax*, Lund
- Loraux, N. 1993. 'On the race of women and some of its tribes: Hesiod and Semonides', in N. Loraux tr. C. Levine *The Children of Athena* (Princeton) 72-110
- Löschhorn, B. 1971. 'Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von lat. *organum*', *MH* 28: 193-226
- Lovejoy, A. O. and Boas, G. 1935. *Primitivism and related ideas in antiquity*, Baltimore
- Luck, G. 1972. 'The textual history of Juvenal and the Oxford lines', *HSPH* 76: 217-31
- Lutz, C. E. 1947. 'Musonius Rufus "the Roman Socrates"', *YCLS* 10: 3-147
- Maas, M. 1899. 'Die neuen Juvenalverse', *ALL* 11: 419-23
- Maass, E. 1925. 'Eunuchos und Verwandtes', *RhM* 74: 432-76
- MacBain, B. 1982. *Prodigy and expiation: a study in religion and politics in Republican Rome*, Brussels
- Macurdy, G. 1935. 'Julia Berenice', *AJP* 56: 246-53
- Mähl, E. 1974. *Gymnastik und Athletik im Denken der Römer*, Amsterdam
- Mal-Maeder, D. van, ed., 2001. *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses livre II*, Groningen
- Marquardt, J. 1886. *Das Privatleben der Römer*, 2nd edn, rev. A. Mau, Leipzig
- Marshall, A. J. 1989. 'Ladies at law: the role of women in the Roman civil courts', in Deroux v: 35-54
1990. 'Roman ladies on trial: the case of Maesia of Sentinum', *Phoenix* 44: 46-59
- Marshall, F. H. 1968. *Catalogue of the finger rings, Greek, Etruscan and Roman in the department of antiquities, British Museum*, London
- Martyn, J. R. C. 1976. 'Juvenal Satire 6.63-6', *Hermes* 104: 252-3
1978. 'Some textual emendations in Juvenal', *Hermes* 106: 213-19
1979. 'Juvenal's wit', *WS* 8: 219-38
- Marzullo, B. 1983. 'Iuven. VI 418-423', *MCr* 18: 259-64
- Mason, H. A. 1963. 'Is Juvenal a classic?', in J. P. Sullivan, ed. *Critical essays on Roman literature: satire* (London) 93-176
- Mathiesen, T. J. 1999. *Apollo's lyre*, Lincoln, NE

- Mattingly, H. 1936. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British museum*, vol. III, London
- Maurin, J. 1983. 'Labor matronalis', in E. Lévy, ed. *La femme dans les sociétés antiques* (Strasbourg) 139–55
- Mayer, R. 1983. 'Catullus' divorce', *CQ* 33: 297–8
2003. 'Persona<l> problems: the literary persona in antiquity revisited', *MD* 50: 55–80
- Mayor, A. 2010. *The poison king: the life and legend of Mithridates*, Princeton
- Mazzarino, A. 1955. *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta aetatis Caesaris*, vol. 1, Turin
- McClure, L. K. 2003. *Courtesans at table: gender and Greek literary culture in Athenaeus*, New York/London
- McCullough, A. 2008. 'Female gladiators in imperial Rome', *CW* 101: 197–209
- McDermott, W. C. 1970. 'Fabricius Veiento', *AJP* 91: 129–48
- McDonnell, M. 1983 [=1986]. 'Divorce initiated by women in Rome: the Plautine evidence', *AJAH* 8: 54–80
2006. *Roman manliness*, Cambridge
- McGinn, T. A. J. 1998a. 'Caligula's brothel on the Palatine', *EMC* 17: 95–107
- 1998b. 'Feminae probrosae and the litter', *CJ* 93: 241–50
2004. *The economy of prostitution in the Roman world*, Ann Arbor
- McLaren, A. 1990. *A history of contraception from antiquity to the present day*, Oxford
- Mellink, M. J. 1943. *Hyakinthos*, Utrecht
- Mencacci, F. 1986. 'Sanguis/cruor', *MD* 17: 25–91
- Michaelides, S. 1978. *The music of ancient Greece*, London
- Mikocki, T. 1995. *Sub specie deae: les impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées à des déesses*, Rome
- Millar, F. 1977. *The emperor in the Roman world 31 B.C.–A.D. 337*, London
- Minieri, L. 1982. 'Vini usus feminis ignotus', *Labeo* 28: 150–63
- Mitropoulou, E. 1975. *Kneeling worshippers in Greek and Oriental literature and art*, Athens
- Moles, J. L. 1984. 'Aristotle and Dido's hamartia', *G&R* 31: 48–54
- Mommsen, Th. 1887–8. *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3rd edn, Leipzig
1899. *Römisches Strafrecht*, Leipzig
- Moreau, Ph. 1978. 'Osculum, basium, sauium', *RPh* 52: 87–97
- Morgan, L. 2010. *Musa pedestris: metre and meaning in Roman verse*, Oxford
- Morrow, K. D. 1985. *Greek footwear and the dating of sculpture*, Madison, WI
- Mosci Sassi, M. G. 1992. *Il linguaggio gladiatorio*, Bologna
- Muecke, F. 1984. 'Turning away and looking down: some gestures in the Aeneid', *BICS* 31: 105–12
- Mueller, H.-F. 2002. *Roman religion in Valerius Maximus*, New York

- Myers, K. S. 1996. 'The poet and the procuress: the *lena* in Latin love elegy', *JRS* 86: 1–21
- Nadeau, Y. 2011. *See under* Juvenal: editions, commentaries and translations
- Naerebout, F. G. 2009. 'Das Reich tanzt...dance in the Roman Empire and its discontents', in O. Hekster *et al.*, eds. *Ritual dynamics and religious change in the Roman empire* (Leiden) 143–58
- Nardo, D. 1973. *La sesta satira di Giovenale e la tradizione erotico-elegiaca latina*, Padova
1977. 'Due note giovenaliane (6, 401 e 460)', *RCCM* 19: 535–40
- Nenova-Merdjanova, R. 1999. 'Roman bronze vessels as part of *instrumentum balnei*', in J. de Laine and D. E. Johnston, eds. *Roman baths and bathing Part 1* (Portsmouth, RI) 130–4
- Nettleship, H. 1889. *Contributions to Latin lexicography*, Oxford
- Newby, Z. 2005. *Greek athletics in the Roman world*, Oxford
- Nicolaides, A. G. 1997. 'Plutarch on women and marriage', *WS* 110: 27–88
- Niedermann, M. 1950. 'Der Suffixtypus -ullus, -a, -um lateinischer Appellativa', *MH* 7: 147–58
- Nielsen, H. S. 1987. 'Alumnus', *C&M* 38: 141–88
1997. 'Interpreting epithets in Roman epitaphs', in Rawson and Weaver 1997: 169–204
- Nielsen, I. 1993. *Thermae et balnea*, 2nd edn, Aarhus
- Nilsson, M. P. 1951. 'Das Ei im Totenkult der Alten', in his *Opuscula Selecta* 1 (Lund) 3–20
1957. *The Dionysiac mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman age*, Lund
- Nisbet, G. 2012. 'Revoicing imperial satire', in Braund and Osgood 2012: 486–512
- Nisbet, R. G. M. 1961. *Cicero in Pisonem*, Oxford
1962. 'Review and discussion of K. Müller, ed. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon* and W. V. Clausen, ed. *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae*', *JRS* 52: 227–38 = Nisbet 1995: 6–28
1995. *Collected papers on Latin literature*, ed. S. J. Harrison, Oxford
1999. 'Epilegomena on the text of Juvenal', *AA* 39: 225–30
- Nock, A. D. 1972. *Arthur Darby Nock: essays on religion and the ancient world*, ed. Z. Stewart, Oxford
- Noegel, S. B. 2007. *Nocturnal ciphers: the allusive language of dreams in the ancient Near East*, New Haven
- Norden, E. 1970. *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, 5th edn, Stuttgart
- Norrman, R. and Haarberg, J. 1980. *Nature and language: a semiotic study of cucurbits in literature*, London/Boston, MA
- Obermayer, H. P. 1998. *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche "Homosexualität"*, Tübingen

- Ogle, M. B. 1910. 'Laurel in ancient religion and folk-lore', *AJP* 31: 287–311
- Oliver, A. 2000. 'Jewelry for the unmarried', in D. E. Kleiner and S. B. Matheson, eds. *I Claudia, II* (Austin, TX) 115–24
- Olson, K. 2002. 'Matrona and whore: the clothing of women in Roman antiquity', *Fashion Theory* 6.4: 387–420
2003. 'Roman underwear revisited', *CW* 96: 201–10
2008. *Dress and the Roman woman*, London/New York
2009. 'Cosmetics in Roman antiquity: substance, remedy, poison', *CW* 102: 291–310
- Onians, R. B. 1951. *The origins of European thought*, 2nd edn, Cambridge
- Oster, R. 1988. 'When men wore veils to worship', *NTS* 34: 481–505
- Owen, S. G. 1905. 'On the *tunica retiarii*', *CR* 19: 354–7
- Pabón, J. M. 1939. 'El griego, lengua de la intimidad entre los Romanos', *Emerita* 7: 126–31
- Pack, R. A. 1972. 'A Greek chiromantic fragment', *TAPhA* 103: 367–80
- Palmer, R. E. A. 1974. 'Roman shrines of female chastity', *RSA* 4: 113–59
- Papanghelis, T. D. 1991. 'Catullus and Callimachus on large women (a reconsideration of c. 86)', *Mnemosyne* 44: 372–86
- Parke, H. W. 1967. *The oracles of Zeus*, Oxford
- Parke, H. W. and Wormell, D. E. W. 1956. *The Delphic oracle*, vol. 1, Oxford
- Parker, H. 1998. 'Loyal slaves and loyal wives', in S. R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan, eds. *Women and slaves in Greco-Roman culture* (London/New York) 152–73
2012. 'Manuscripts of Juvenal and Persius', in Braund and Osgood 2012: 137–61
- Parker, H. and Braund, S. 2012. 'Imperial satire and the scholars', in Braund and Osgood 2012: 436–64
- Parker, L. P. E. 2003. 'Alcestis: Euripides to Ted Hughes', *G&R* 50: 1–30
- Parkin, T. 1992. *Demography and Roman Society*, Baltimore
2003. *Old age in the Roman world*, Baltimore
- Parsons, P. J. 1971. 'A Greek *Satyricon*?', *BICS* 18: 53–68
- Patzer, H. 1955. 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12: 77–95
- Pausch, M. 1996. 'Neues zur Bekleidung im Mosaik der "Bikini-Mädchen"', *Nikephoros* 9: 169–74
- Pearce, T. E. V. 1966. 'The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter', *CQ* 16: 140–71, 298–320
1974. 'The role of the wife as *custos* in ancient Rome', *Eranos* 72: 16–33
- Perelli, A. 1992. 'Il paradigma di Elena e un' allusione in Giovenale', *Euphrosyne* 20: 187–210
- Petersen, W. 1917. 'Latin diminution of adjectives II', *CPh* 12: 49–67
- Petrochilos, N. 1974. *Roman attitudes to the Greeks*, Athens

- Petropoulos, J. C. B. 1988. 'The erotic magical papyri', in B. Mandilaras, ed. *Proceedings of the XVIII international congress of papyrology, Athens 1986* (Athens) 215-22
- Pharr, C. 1932. 'The interdiction of magic in Roman law', *TAPhA* 63: 269-95
- Phillips, O. 2002. 'The witches' Thessaly', in P. Mirecki and M. Meyer, eds. *Magic and ritual in the ancient world* (Leiden) 378-86
- Pichon, R. 1913. 'Quelques textes relatifs a l'histoire de l'Atellane', *RPh* 37: 254-7
1966. *Index verborum amatoriorum*, Hildesheim
- Plaza, M. 2006. *The function of humour in Roman verse satire*, Oxford
- Pomeroy, S. 1986. 'Copronyms and the exposure of infants in Egypt', in R. S. Bagnall and W. V. Harris, eds. *Studies in Roman law in memory of A. Arthur Schiller* (Leiden): 147-62
- ed. 1999. *Plutarch's advice to the bride and groom and a consolation to his wife*, New York/Oxford
- Postgate, J. P. 1899. 'On the new fragments of Juvenal', *CR* 13: 206-8
- Powell, J. 1999. 'Stylistic registers in Juvenal', in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, eds. *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry* (Oxford) 311-34
- Prag, A. J. N. W. 1985. *The Oresteia: iconographic and narrative tradition*, Warminster
- Puelma, M. 1960. 'Die Dichterbegegnung in Theokrits "Thalysien"', *MH* 17: 144-64
- Questa, C. 1995. 'Messalina, meretrix augusta', in Raffaelli 1995: 399-423
- Raepsaet-Charlier, M.-T. 1987. *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (I<sup>er</sup>-IV<sup>e</sup> siècles)* Leuven
- Raffaelli, R., ed. 1995. *Vicende e figure femminili in Grecia e a Roma*, Ancona
- Ramsey, J. T. 2007. 'A catalogue of Greco-Roman comets from 500 B.C. to A.D. 400', *JHA* 38: 175-97
- Ransom, C. L. 1905. *Couches and beds of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, Chicago
- Rauh, N. K. 1989. 'Auctioneers and the Roman economy', *Historia* 38: 451-71
- Rawson, B. 1986a. 'Children in the Roman familia', in Rawson 1986b: 170-200
- ed. 1986b. *The family in ancient Rome: new perspectives*, London/Sydney
- ed. 1991. *Marriage, divorce, and children in ancient Rome*, Canberra/Oxford
2003. *Children and childhood in Roman Italy*, Oxford
- Rawson, B. and Weaver, P., eds. 1997. *The Roman family in Italy*, Oxford
- Rawson, E. 1978. 'Caesar, Etruria, and the disciplina Etrusca', *JRS* 68: 132-52
- Reeve, M. D. 1973. 'Gladiators in Juvenal's sixth satire', *CR* 23: 124-5



- Reinmuth, O. W. 1967. 'The meaning of *ceroma* in Martial and Juvenal', *Phoenix* 21: 191–5
- Reynolds, R. W. 1946. 'The adultery mime', *CQ* 40: 77–84
- Richard, L. 1966. 'Juvénal et les Galles de Cybèle', *RHR* 169: 51–67
- Richlin, A. 1981. 'Approaches to the sources on adultery at Rome', in H. P. Foley, ed. *Reflections of women in antiquity* (New York) 379–404
1984. 'Invective against women in Roman satire', *Arethusa* 17: 67–80
1992. *The garden of Priapus*, rev. edn, New York/Oxford
- 1992–3. 'Not before homosexuality: the materiality of the *cinaedus*', *JHSex* 3: 523–73
1995. 'Making up a woman: the face of Roman gender', in H. Eilberg-Schwartz and W. Doniger, eds. *Off with her head!: the denial of women's identity in myth, religion, and culture* (Berkeley) 185–213
- Richter, G. M. A. 1966. *The furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, London
- Riddle, J. M. 1992. *Contraception and abortion from the ancient world to the Renaissance*, Cambridge, MA
- Rieger, B. 1999. 'Die Capitolia des Kaisers Domitian', *Nikephoros* 12: 171–203
- Riess, W. 2012. 'Rari exempli femina: female virtues on Roman funerary monuments', in S. L. James and S. Dillon, eds. *A companion to women in the ancient world* (Malden/Oxford) 491–501
- Rimell, V. 2008. *Martial's Rome*, Cambridge
- Rist, J. M. 1972. *Epicurus*, Cambridge
- Robert, L. 1940. *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec*, Paris
1950. 'Monuments de gladiateurs dans l'orient grec', *Hellenica* 8: 39–72
- Robinson, O. F. 1981. 'Slaves and the criminal law', *ZRG* 98: 213–54
- Roller, M. B. 2003. 'Horizontal women: posture and sex in the Roman *convivium*', *AJP* 124: 377–422
- Rosati, G. 1996. 'Il modello di Aretusa (Prop. IV 3): tracce elegiache nell'epica del 1 sec. d. C.', *Maia* 48: 139–55
- Rose, H. J. 1927. 'Mox', *CQ* 21: 57–66
- Rosen, R. M. 2007. *Making mockery: the poetics of ancient satire*, Oxford
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. 1999. 'Tracing "medulla" as a "locus eroticus"', *Arethusa* 32: 19–47
- Roussel, P. 1915–16. *Les cultes Égyptiens a Délos du 111<sup>e</sup> au 1<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris/Nancy
- Rudd, N. 1981. 'Romantic love in classical times?', *Ramus* 10: 140–58
1986. *Themes in Roman satire*, London
- Rüpke, J. 1990. *Domi Militiae*, Stuttgart
2007. *Religion of the Romans*, tr. and ed. R. Gordon, Cambridge
- Rumscheid, J. 2000. *Kranz und Krone*, Tübingen
- Rutledge, S. H. 2001. *Imperial inquisitions*, London/New York

- Şahin, S. 1975. 'Das Grabmal des Pantomimen Krispos', *ZPE* 18: 293-7
- Saint-Denis, E. de 1967. 'Archéologie et philologie aux sources de la Seine', *REL* 45: 436-56
- Sallares 2002. *Malaria and Rome*, Oxford
- Saller, R. P. 1982. *Personal patronage under the early Empire*, Cambridge
- 1984a. 'Familia, domus and the Roman conception of the family', *Phoenix* 38: 336-55
- 1984b. 'Roman dowry and the devolution of property in the principate', *CQ* 34: 195-205
1991. 'Corporal punishment, authority and obedience in the Roman household', in Rawson 1991: 144-65
1994. *Patriarchy, property and death in the Roman family*, Cambridge
- Sanders, G. M. 1972. 'Gallos', *RAC* VIII 984-1034
- Santoro L'Hoir, F. 1992. *The rhetoric of gender terms*, Leiden
- Sassi, M. G. 1995. 'Ludia', in Raffaelli 1995: 389-95
- Sauvage, A. 1970. 'Les insectes dans la poésie romaine', *Latomus* 29: 269-96
- Scamuzzi, U. 1966. 'Contributo ad una obiettiva conoscenza della vita e dell'opera di Marco Valerio Marziale', *Rivista di Studi Classici* 14: 149-207
- Scarborough, J. 1969. *Roman Medicine*, London
1991. 'The pharmacology of sacred plants, herbs and roots', in C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink, eds. *Magika hiera* (New York/Oxford) 138-74
- Schäfer, D. 2001. 'Frauen in der Arena', in H. Bellen and H. Heinen, eds. *Fünfzig Jahre Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei an der Mainzer Akademie 1950-2000* (Stuttgart) 243-68
- Schäfer, P. 1997. *Judeophobia*, Cambridge, MA
- Schilling, R. 1982. *La religion romaine de Vénus*, 2nd edn, Paris
- Schmidt, H. 1907. *Veteres philosophi quomodo iudicauerint de precibus*, Giessen
- Scholz, B. I. 1992. *Untersuchungen zur Tracht der römischen matrona*, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna
- Schove, D. J. 1984. *Chronology of eclipses and comets AD 1-1000*, Woodbridge, Suffolk
- Schrijvers, P. H. 1985. *Eine medizinische Erklärung der männlichen Homosexualität aus der Antike*, Amsterdam
- Schrömbges, P. 1988. 'Caligulas Wahn', *Tyche* 3: 171-90
- Schuhmann, E. 1977. 'Der Typ der *uxor dotata* in den Komödien des Plautus', *Philologus* 121: 45-65
- Schultz, C. 2006. *Women's religious activity in the Roman Republic*, Chapel Hill
- Scobie, A. 1986. 'Slums, sanitation and mortality in the Roman world', *Klio* 68: 399-433
- Scott, I. G. 1927. *The grand style in the Satires of Juvenal*, Northampton, MA
- Scullard, H. H. 1981. *Festivals and ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, London

- Sette, G. 2000. *L'abbigliamento*, Rome
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1956. *Propertiana*, Cambridge
- Shaw, B. D. 1987. 'The age of Roman girls at marriage: some reconsiderations', *JRS* 77: 30–46
2001. 'Raising and killing children; two Roman myths', *Mnemosyne* 54: 31–77
2002. "'With whom I lived": measuring Roman marriage', *AncSoc* 32: 195–242
- Shelton, K. J. 1981. *The Esquiline treasure*, London
- Shinnie, P. L. 1961. 'A late Latin inscription', *Kush* 9: 284–6
1967. *Meroe: a civilization of the Sudan*, London
- Sieglin, W. 1935. *Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Allertums*, Munich
- Singleton, D. 1972. 'Juvenal vi.1–20, and some ancient attitudes to the Golden age', *G&R* 19: 151–65
- Sittl, C. 1890. *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig
- Skutsch, K. L. 1936. 'Libramen aequum', *Die Antike* 12: 49–64
- Smith Jnr., W. S. 1980. 'Husband vs. wife in Juvenal's sixth satire', *CW* 73: 323–32
- Snowden, F. M. Jnr. 1956. 'Ethiopians and the Isiac worship', *AC* 25: 112–16
1970. *Blacks in antiquity*, Cambridge, MA
- Sokolowski, F. 1955. *Lois sacrées de l'asie mineure*, Paris
- Spaeth, B. S. 1996. *The Roman goddess Ceres*, Austin, TX
- Sparkes, B. A. 1991. *Greek pottery: an introduction*, Manchester/New York
- Staples, A. 1998. *From Good Goddess to Vestal Virgins*, London/New York
- Starr, I. 1983. *The rituals of the diviner*, Malibu, CA
- Stemplinger, E. 1925. *Antike und moderne Volksmedizin*, Leipzig
- Stengel, P. 1910. *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, Leipzig/Berlin
- Stephens, J. 2008. 'Ancient Roman hairdressing: on (hair)pins and needles', *JRA*: 21: 111–32
- Stern, M. 1980. *Greek and Latin authors on Jews and Judaism*, vol. II, Jerusalem
- Stevenson, W. 1995. 'The rise of eunuchs in Greco-Roman antiquity', *JHSex* 5: 495–511
- Stieda, L. 1902. 'Die Infibulation bei Griechen und Römern', *Anatomische Hefte* 19: 231–305
- Sudhaus, S. 1906. 'Lautes und leises Beten', *ARW* 9: 185–200
- Swain, S. 2004. 'Bilingualism and biculturalism in Antonine Rome', in L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi, eds. *The worlds of Aulus Gellius* (Oxford) 3–40
- Syme, R. 1949. 'Personal names in *Annals* I–VI', *JRS* 39: 6–18
1984. *Roman Papers*, vol. III, ed. A. R. Birley, Oxford

- Tarrant, R. J. 1983. 'Juvenal', in L. D. Reynolds, ed. *Texts and transmission* (Oxford) 200–3
- Tatum, W. J. 1999. *The patrician tribune*, Chapel Hill/London
- Tennant, P. 2002. 'Beyond the rhetoric (Part 2): Juvenal and the Roman elite in *Satires* 4–6', *SyllClass* 13: 154–79
- Teuffel, W. 1865. 'Zu Juvenal', *RhM* 20: 473–9
- Thierfelder, A. 1941. 'Juvenal 6, 57', *Hermes* 76: 317–18
1956. 'Obscaenus', in *Navicula Chiloniensis* (Leiden) 98–106
- Thomas, Y. 1986. 'Le "ventre": corps maternel, droit paternel', *Le genre humain* 14: 211–36
- Thompson, D'Arcy 1947. *A glossary of Greek fishes*, London
- Thompson, L. A. 1989. *Romans and blacks*, London/Oklahoma
- Thompson, Stith 1956. *Motif index of folk-literature*, vol. II, Bloomington, IN
- Thulin, O. 1906. *Die etruskische Disciplin*, vol. II, Göteborg
- Tinh, V. Tran Tam 1964. *Essai sur le culte d'Isis à Pompéi*, Paris
1971. *Le culte des divinités orientales à Herculaneum*, Leiden
- Todd, F. A. 1943. 'Some *cucurbitaceae* in Latin literature', *CQ* 37: 101–11
- Toynbee, J. M. C. 1973. *Animals in Roman life and art*, London
- Toynbee, J. M. C. and Ward-Perkins, J. B. 1956. *The shrine of St Peter and the Vatican excavations*, London
- Tracy, V. A. 1980. 'Aut captantur aut captant', *Latomus* 39: 399–402
- Treggiari, S. 1971. 'Libertine ladies', *CW* 64: 196–8
1973. 'Cicero, Horace and mutual friends: Lamiae and Varrones Murenae', *Phoenix* 27: 245–61
1976. 'Jobs for women', *AJAH* 1: 76–104
- 1991 'Divorce Roman style: how easy and how frequent was it?', in Rawson 1991: 31–46
- Trowbridge, M. L. 1930. *Philological studies in Ancient glass*, Urbana, IL
- Tschiedel, H. J. 1981. *Caesars "Anticato"*, Darmstadt
- Tupet, A.-M. 1976. *La magie dans la poésie latine*, Paris
1986. 'Rites magiques dans l'antiquité romaine', *ANRW* xvi 3.2591–675
- Turcan, R. 2000. *The gods of ancient Rome*, tr. A. Nevill, Edinburgh
- Turner, E. G. 1978. *The terms recto and verso: the anatomy of the papyrus roll*, *Papyrologica Bruxellensia* 16, Brussels
- Uden, J. 2011. 'Codeswitches in Caesar and Catullus', *Antichthon* 45: 113–30
- Urech, H. J. 1999. *Hoher und niederer Stil in den Satiren Juvenals*, Bern/Frankfurt am Main
- Uría, J. 2007. 'The semantics and pragmatics of Ciceronian invective', in J. Booth, ed. *Cicero on the attack* (Swansea) 47–70
- Van Der Meer, L. B. 1987. *The bronze liver of Piacenza*, Amsterdam
- van Hooff, A. J. L. 1990. *From autothanasia to suicide*, London/New York

- Vanderlip, V. 1972. *The four Greek hymns of Isidorus and the cult of Isis*, Toronto
- Venit, M. S. 1998. 'Women in their cups', *CW* 92: 117–30
- Vermaseren, M. 1977. *Cybele and Attis: the myth and the cult*, London
- Versnel, H. S. 1976. 'Two types of Roman *devotio*', *Mnemosyne* 29: 365–410
- Vesley, M. 1998. 'Gladiatorial training for girls in the *collegia iuvenum* of the Roman Empire', *EMC* 17: 85–93
- Vidén, G. 1993. *Women in Roman literature*, Göteborg
- Vidman, L. 1969. *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae*, Berlin
- Ville, G. 1981. *La gladiature en occident des origines à la mort de Domitien*, Rome
- von Bothmer, D. 1957. *Amazons in Greek art*, Oxford
- von Hüttenbach, F. L. 1976. 'Soloï und Soloïkismos', *RhM* 119: 336–45
- von Winterfeld, P. 1899. 'Zu den Oxforder Juvenalversen', *B. phil. Woch.* 19: 793–4
- Walker, A. 1992. 'Eros and the eye in the love-letters of Philostratus', *PCPhS* 38: 132–48
- Walker, S. 1991. 'Bearded Men', *Journal of the history of collections* 3: 265–77
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1994. *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*, Princeton
1997. 'Rethinking the Roman *atrium* house', in R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Domestic space in the Roman world* (Portsmouth, RI) 219–40
- Wardle, D. 1994. *Suetonius' Life of Caligula*, Brussels
- Waters, K. H. 1969. 'Traianus Domitiani continuator', *AJP* 90: 385–405
- Watson, A. 1983. 'Roman slave law and Romanist ideology', *Phoenix* 37: 53–65
- Watson, G. 1966. *Theriac and mithridatium*, London
- Watson, L. 1990. 'Rustic Sufferus (Catullus 22) and literary rusticity', *PLLS* 6: 13–33.
1994. 'Horace *Odes* 1. 23 and 1. 25: a thematic pairing?', *AUMLA* 82: 67–84
2003. *A commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford
2004. 'Martial 12.32: an indigent immigrant?', *Mnemosyne* 57: 311–24
2006. 'Catullus and the poetics of incest', *Antichthon* 40: 35–48
- 2008a. 'Juvenal *Satire* 6: misogyny or misogamy? The evidence of pro-treptics on marriage', *PLLS* 13: 269–96
- 2008b. 'Of hernias and wine-jugs: *Catalepton* 12', *Mnemosyne* 61: 245–56
- Watson, L. and Watson, P. 1996. 'Two problems in Martial', *CQ* 46: 586–91
- Watson, P. A. 1982. 'Martial's fascination with *lusci*', *G&R* 29: 71–6
1983. 'Puella and virgo', *Glotta* 61: 119–44
1992. 'Balls of crystal and amber: fact or fantasy?', *LCM* 17.2: 23–7
1993. 'Stepmothers and *hippomanes*. *Georgics* 3.282f.', *Latomus* 52: 842–7

1995. *Ancient stepmothers: myth, misogyny and reality*, Leiden
2005. 'Non tristis torus et tamen pudicus: the sexuality of the *matrona* in Martial', *Mnemosyne* 58: 62–87
- 2007a. 'Juvenal's *scripta matrona*: elegiac resonances in *Satire* 6', *Mnemosyne* 60: 628–40
- 2007b. 'A *matrona* makes up: fantasy and reality in Juvenal, *Sat.* 6, 457–507', *RhM* 150: 375–95
2012. 'The flight of *Pudicitia*', *Mnemosyne* 65: 62–79
- Watt, W. S. 2002. 'Notes on Juvenal', *Hermes* 130: 299–305
- Weaver, P. R. C. 1972. *Familia Caesaris*, Cambridge
- Weber, M. 1996. *Antike Badekultur*, Munich
- Weinreich, O. 1944/48 'Epigrammstudien 1. Epigramm und Pantomimus', *Sitz. Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften (philosophisch-historische Klasse)*, Abhandl. 1
- White, K. D. 1970. *Roman farming*, London
1975. *Farm equipment of the Roman world*, Cambridge
- Whittick, C. C. 1952. 'Vasa murrina and the lexica', *JRS* 42: 66–7
- Wiesen, D. S. 1980. 'The "great priestess of the tree": Juvenal VI, 544–54', *CJ* 76: 14–20
1989. 'The verbal basis of Juvenal's satiric vision', *ANRW* II 33.1.708–33
- Wild, R. A. 1981. *Water in the cultic worship of Isis and Sarapis*, Leiden
- Wildfang, R. L. 2006. *Rome's Vestal Virgins*, London/New York
- Wilhelm-Hooijbergh, A. E. 1954. *Peccatum*, Groningen
- Wille, G. 1967. *Musica Romana*, Amsterdam
- Williams, C. A. 2010. *Roman homosexuality*, 2nd edn, New York/Oxford
- Williams, F. 2005. 'Problems of text and interpretation in Juvenal *Satire* 6', *PLLS* 12: 197–206
- Williams, G. 1958. 'Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies and ideals', *JRS* 48: 16–29
1978. *Change and decline*, Berkeley
- Williams, M. H. 1988. "Θεοσεβής γὰρ ἦν" – the Jewish tendencies of Poppea Sabina', *JTS* 39: 97–111
1998. *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans*, London
- Willis, J. A. 1989. 'Juvenalis male auctus', *Mnemosyne* 42: 441–68
- Wills, J. 1996. *Repetition in Latin poetry*, Oxford
- Wilson, L. M. 1938. *The clothing of the ancient Romans*, Baltimore
- Winkler, M. M. 1983. *The persona in three satires of Juvenal*, Hildesheim/Zurich/New York
- Winstedt, E. O. 1899. 'A Bodleian MS. of Juvenal', *CR* 13: 201–5
- Winterbottom, M. 1998. 'Quintilian the moralist', in T. Albaladejo, E. del Río and J. A. Caballero, eds. *Quintiliano: historia y actualidad de la retórica*, vol. 1 (Calahorra) 317–34
- Wiseman, T. P. 1987. *Roman studies: literary and historical*, Liverpool

1998. 'A stroll on the rampart', in M. Cima and E. La Rocca, eds., *Horti Romani* (Rome) 14–22
- Witt, R. E. 1971. *Isis in the Graeco-Roman world*, London
- Wölfflin, A. 1933. 'Die Geminatio im Lateinischen', in G. Meyer, ed. *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Leipzig) 285–328
- Wood, S. 1978. 'Alcestis on Roman sarcophagi', *AJA* 82: 499–510
- Wray, D. 2001. *Catullus and the poetics of Roman manhood*, Cambridge
- Wuilleumier, P. 1939. *Tarente des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris
- Wülker, L. 1903. *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Prodigienswesens bei den Römern*, Diss. Leipzig
- Wyke, M. 1994. 'Woman in the mirror', in L. J. Archer, S. Fischler and M. Wyke, eds. *Women in ancient societies* (Basingstoke) 134–51
- Yarden, L. 1971. *The tree of light: a study of the Menorah*, London
- Yardley, J. C. 1973. 'Sick-visiting in Roman elegy', *Phoenix* 27: 283–8
1981. 'Catullus 11: the end of a friendship', *SO* 56: 63–9
- Zwierlein-Diehl, E. 1980. 'Simpuvium Numae', *Tainia: Festschrift für R. Hampe*, vol. 1 (Mainz) 405–22

# INDEXES

Unless prefixed by *p.*, *pp.* or intro., all references in the indexes are to the notes in the Commentary on *Satire* 6. They are listed in the order in which they appear therein.

## GENERAL INDEX

- abortion/abortifacients, 592–609, nn.  
on 594–99 *passim*  
Aelii Lamiae, 385  
Agamemnon, p. 18, 656, 658, 660–1  
Agrippina, 615, 620–1  
Alcestis, 652–4, nn. on 652–4 *passim*  
ancestry, noble, 38–81, 161–83, 162–3,  
172–7, 385  
Anderson, p. 3, p. 6, pp. 8–9, p. 12,  
p. 19, pp. 36–7  
anti-cosmetic tradition, 457–73,  
461–73, 462, 474–507  
Anubis, 532–4, 533, 534  
Appii Claudii, 385  
archaising movement, 454  
Ariadne, 82–113, 85  
Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae*,  
pp. 28–9  
asses' milk, 462, nn. on 468–72 *passim*  
Astraea, 19–20, 19  
astrologers, 508–47, 553–6, 553, 560,  
562–4, 565–8, 586, 591; *see also*  
'Ptolemaeus/Seleucus', 'Thrasyllus'  
astrology: configuration of planets,  
569–70, 571, 574; numerological  
prognostications, 572–6; use of in  
treating illness, 579, 580–1  
Atellan farce, 71–2, 71, 72  
athletic contests/athletics, pp. 45–6,  
246, 320–1, 356, 421  
augury, 508–47, 585–6, 585  
Augusta, 118  
Augustan marriage legislation, p. 19,  
pp. 22–3, p. 42, 23, 468–70, 594; *see*  
*also* 'lex Iulia'  
  
banquet as satiric theme, 300–5, 302,  
303–4; *see also* 'dining customs'  
baths and bathing, 374–5, 419,  
419–20, 420–3, 425–6, 427–9, 447  
Bathyllus, p. 43 n. 236, 63  
beards, 15–16, 105–6, 215, 356, O6,  
366–7  
bee-woman, p. 27  
  
Bellandi, p. 8 n. 61, p. 9 n. 64, p. 37  
n. 203, 1–24, 38, 82–113, 106, 309,  
335–6, O1, O18, 401, 629–33  
Beronice, 156, 157–8, 157, 159  
black, a sinister colour, 601  
'black African', 599–600  
black swan, 165  
Bona Dea: rites of, 314–45, 314,  
314–15, 315, 324, 328, 329, 335–6,  
335; scandal, 336–41, 342–5  
Braund: p. 1, pp. 3–5, pp. 7–10,  
pp. 19–20, p. 26, p. 33, p. 37, p. 39,  
p. 48, pp. 51–2, p. 55, 1, 16–17,  
116–19, 167, O11, O18, O25–6,  
549, 634–7  
breast-feeding, 7–11, 9, 592–3; *see also*  
'wet-nursing'  
Britannicus, 124  
bronze, apotropaic banging of, 441–3  
brothels and prostitution, p. 35, nn. on  
114–32 *passim*, 194–5, 196–7, 241,  
259, 300–5, 301, 306–13, 311, 320,  
331–2, 334, O14–16, O15–16, O16,  
489, 506  
  
Caligula, 416, 610–26, 615–17, 618,  
624, 625  
Canopus, 84  
Capitolia, p. 45; 387–8  
castration, nn. on 366–78 *passim*,  
514–15, 514, 515  
Catullus c. 64, 82–113, 85  
Celsus, 245  
child-murder, ritual, 552  
children: exposure of, 592–609,  
604–5; non-resemblance of to  
husband, p. 23, 81; supposititious,  
p. 28, 592–609, 602, 604–5;  
vulnerability to early death, 388–90  
Circus, 87, 582–4, 582–3, 583, 588  
Claudius, 115, 118, 124, 322, 620–1,  
622, 622–3  
Clodius, p. 28, pp. 53–4, 314–45, 324,  
336–41, 337, 342–5, 345



Clytemnestra, p. 12, p. 18 n. 90,  
627-61, nn. on 656-61 *passim*

comet, 407-8, 407

contraceptives, 592-609, 595

Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, p. 10,  
p. 27, 161-83, nn. on 167-76 *passim*

cosmetics, O21, 457-73, nn. on  
461-73 *passim*

country women, chastity of, 55-7, 287

crucifixion, 219-23

Cybele, 69, 314, 315, 511-12, 512,  
513, 515

Danaids, 614A-C

dancing: erotic, 320-6, O19, 382;  
ritual, 314, 314-15

declamation, p. 7, p. 18, p. 34, p. 39,  
599-600, 627, 633

De Decker, p. 7, p. 34 nn. 186-7, p. 39  
n. 217, p. 48 n. 269, p. 50 n. 275,  
p. 51 n. 281

Dido, p. 23, 14, 435

dining customs, 303-4, O14, 436-7; *see*  
*also* 'vomiting, pre-prandial'

Dionysus, 52, 70, 314-45, 328, 335-6,  
378

divorce, p. 24 n. 134, p. 45, 136-41,  
137, 146-8, 226, 229-30

Domitian, p. 4, 78, 87, 112-13, 387-8,  
398-412, 524-5

dreams, 530, 531, 547

East, decadence of, 296, 314-15

education of females, p. 46, 245,

434-56, 434, 435

effeminate, markers of, nn. on

O21-4 *passim*; *see also* *cinaedus*

eggs, 518

elegy, p. 13, 36, 60, 60-1, 140-1, 149,  
231-41, 232-3, 234-5, 235, 272,  
275, O29-34, 461-73, 474-507,  
490

Epicurus, 394-5

epitaphs for wives, intro. § 3 *passim*, 162

Eppia, pp. 14-16, p. 20, p. 51, 82-113,  
112-13

Eriphyle, 627-61, 655

Etruscans, 186, 289

eunuchs, p. 55, O6, nn. on

366-78 *passim*, 512-13, 514-15

Euripides, pp. 27-9, p. 48, 133-5, 643

exile, p. 20, 82-113, 468-70, 469,  
562-4, 563-4, 564; *see also* *deportatio*  
*in insulam*

extispicy, 392, 549-50, 551

eyes, beauty of, 145, O21

Falernian wine, 150, 303-4, O15, 430

female body, revulsion towards,  
pp. 31-2

Floralia, 249-50, 250

foreign expansion, corrupting effects  
of, p. 9, p. 34, 286-300, 298-300

Fortuna, nn. on 605-9 *passim*

fortune-telling 582-4

Galli, nn. on 512-19 *passim*; *see also*  
'castration', 'eunuchs'

gladiators: *auctorati*, O7-13;

equipment of, nn. on 247-63 *passim*,

O11, O12; female, 246-67, 249-50;

*murmillio*, 81, 256-7, 258; *retarius*,

110, O7-13, O9-13, O11, O12;

stage-names, 110; *see also* *lanista*,  
*rudis*

Glaphyrus, 77

Golden Age: *see* 'Myth of the  
Ages'

golden mean, 434-56, 444

grammatical points: acc. of

exclamation, 47; *coepe*, periphrastic

use of with infin., 434; *con-*

intensifying, 100-1; *de* characterising

material, 45; *dum* explanatory, 176;

*esto* dismissing an objection, 222;

*expectare ut*, 75, 239; *i nunc*, 306; *iam*

*iam*, 628; mixed conditional, 98-9;

*quid quod?* 45-6, O9

Grazia Battisti, p. 19 n. 91, p. 34, p. 37

n. 205, p. 38, 634-7

Greek, erotic use of, 184-99, 185-7,  
191, 194-5

guards for women, 235, O27-34, O32

hairdressing, 474-507, 495, 495-6,  
497-501, 498; *see also* 'toupet style'

Hannibal, 168, 170-1, 290-1, 291

Helen, 82-113, 85, 86

Hesiod, p. 26, 1-24, 19-20, 20, 24,  
253-4

Highet, p. 2 n. 17, pp. 8-9, p. 11,  
pp. 35-6, p. 38 n. 214

Horace, p. 1, pp. 3-4, pp. 31-2, p. 38,  
p. 40, p. 49, 136-41, 301

husbands, downtrodden/humiliated  
by wives, nn. on 212-24 *passim*, 276,  
O7, O14-16, 398-412, 400-1, 456,  
nn. on 508-11 *passim*, 612; *see also*

- 'wives, characteristics of: domestic tyranny'
- Isis worship, nn. on 522-41 *passim*
- jewellery, p. 47, 156, 156-7, 381-2, 382, nn. on 457-9 *passim*
- Jews: begging, 543; menorah, 544-5; pork, abstention from, 160; Sabbath, 159, 542
- Juno, 47-8, 48-9, 627
- Juvenal: *apologia* of satirists, p. 3; indignation, pp. 2-3, p. 7, pp. 36-7; life, pp. 1-2; manuscript tradition, p. 51; metre, p. 5 n. 36, p. 50; as moralist? p. 6, p. 36; satiric voice, p. 1, p. 7, p. 36; xenophobia, 16-17
- Juvenal, *Satire 6*: addressee, *see* 'Postumus'; counterfactual/anachronistic/exaggerated criticisms in, pp. 40-8; date of, 398-412, nn. on 407-11 *passim*; epic proportions of, p. 11; grand style, pp. 4-5, p. 17, 634-7; humour, pp. 6-7, pp. 36-8, p. 40; interpolations in, p. 9, p. 51; metrical points: *see also* 'metre'; misogamy, pp. 9-10, p. 33, 25-37, 43; misogyny, pp. 9-10, p. 18, p. 36, p. 38, 357 (*see also* 'misogyny in literature'); names, meaningful, p. 15, 38, 64, 77, 123, 322, 383, 491; Oxford fragment, pp. 52-5; persona, pp. 6-7, p. 19, p. 21 n. 112, intro. § 5 (*see also* 'Speaker' below); prologue, p. 9, p. 11, 1-24, 1; ring composition, pp. 11-13, p. 16, 548-91; Speaker, pp. 3-4, p. 8, pp. 10-12, p. 19, pp. 27-8, pp. 36-8, pp. 40-8, 1-24, 1, 30, 161, 168, 456, 592-609, 595 (*see also* 'Juvenal: satiric voice', 'Juvenal, *Satire 6*: persona'); structure, intro. § 2; style, p. 18, intro. § 6 (*see also* 'stylistic features'); upper-class women the main targets 349-51, p. 284; women essentialised and depersonalised, p. 4, p. 51, 95-6, 357
- knees, crawling on, 524-6
- lapdogs, 653-4
- Latinus, 44
- latrines, public, 602-3
- legacy-hunting: *see captator-trix/captatio*
- legal language, 219-23, O27, O28, 414, 485, 493
- lex Iulia, 38, O29; *see also* 'Augustan marriage legislation'
- litters, 309, 312-13, 351
- Livy, 286-300, 289, 292-3, 295, 314-45, 398-412
- longevity, 192-3
- love-letters, 140-1, 277-8; *see also* *tabellae*
- lower-class females, pp. 14-15, p. 284, 72, 350, 589; *see also mediocris*
- Lucilius, p. 1, p. 3, pp. 30-1, p. 38, p. 49
- Lucretius, p. 31, 1-24
- Lycisca, 123
- Ma-Bellona, 511-12
- magic: forgetfulness induced by, 613-14; love philtres, 133, 610-26, 610-11, 611, 616-17, 616, 626 (*see also hippomanes*); Thessaly, home of magic, p. 17, 610; transference of evil by, 518, 520-1
- marriage: age of girls at, 241; customs associated with, nn. on 25-7 *passim*, 51-2, 78, 79, nn. on 200-5 *passim*, 225, 281; as folly, p. 40, 43; love in, 201-2; marital ideals, intro. § 3, 281-3; reasons for marrying, misguided, 38-81, 136-141, 142-60, 161-83; serial 229-30; sexual passion in, p. 30, p. 42, 5-7, 21-2
- Martial, p. 1, pp. 31-2, p. 35, p. 39, pp. 42-3, pp. 45-6, 53-4, 63-4, 142, 175, 184-99, 194, 229-30, 246, O14-16, 366-78, 380-1, 403, 404, 413-33, 423, nn. on 493-6 *passim*, 599-600, 600, 600-1, 638-9, 638
- matronal virtues: fertility, 162, 177; *gravitas*, 178, 418; loyalty, 82-113, 92-4; *pudor*, 178, 225, 252, 401; silence, p. 25, 438-43; *uerecundia*, p. 25, p. 35, 242-5, 436-56; wish that husband outlive wife, 567-8; *see also pudicitia*
- Maura, 307-8, 307, 308, pp. 283-6
- Medea, p. 12, pp. 17-18, nn. on 642-7 *passim*, 652
- Megalesia, 68, 69
- Meroe, 526-9, 527-8
- Messalina, 114-32, nn. on 114-32 *passim*, 320-6

- metre: lengthening in arsis, 340;  
 monosyllabic ending, 339, 440
- mime/mime actors, 42, 44, 43, 237-8,  
 278, 474-507, 608; *see also* 'Latinus',  
 'Thymele'
- misogyny in literature, intro. § 4
- Mithridates, p. 18, 660-1, 661
- moon, 311, 441-3
- mother-in-law, 231-41, 231
- mothers: exert bad influence on  
 daughters, 231-41, 239-40;  
 murderous, p. 17, 627-61, nn. on  
 629-49 *passim*
- Mystery religions: *see* 'religions,  
 Oriental'
- Myth of the Ages, pp. 11-12, 1-24, nn.  
 on 1-24 *passim*
- New Comedy, pp. 29-30, p. 33, p. 43,  
 136-41
- Nile-water, 526-9, 528
- Niobe, 161-83, nn. on 172-7 *passim*
- Niphates, 409-11
- nudity, sacral, 525
- old age: and loss of virility, 59, 325-6,  
 325, 326; signs of, 144, 145, 147,  
199; *see also* *uetula*
- oracles, 553-6, 554-5, 555
- Ovid, p. 12, 2-4, 19, 23-4, 164, 172-7,  
 nn. on 172-7 *passim*, 289, 398-412,  
 631, 643, 655; *see also* 'elegy',  
 'Sulmo'
- oysters, 302
- pantomime, pp. 42-3, 63-4, 63, 70,  
 O25-6, 652; *see also* 'Paris'
- Paris, p. 15, 63-4, 87, 112-13
- peace, deleterious effects of, 286-300,  
292
- penis, over-sized, 337-8, O25-6, 374-5
- perfumes, 303-4, 457-73, 465, 466
- Persius, p. 1, p. 50 n. 279
- persona theory, attacks on, p. 6,  
 pp. 38-9
- Phrygians and augury, 585-6, 585
- Plotina, 308, 310
- poets, comparison between, 436-7,  
 437
- poisons, 631, 639; *see also* 'toads'
- Pontia, pp. 17-18, 634-40, 638, 640
- Poppaea, 461-73, 462, 468-70, 469
- Postumus, pp. 8-10, 21, 38, 136-41,  
 376-8, 377
- Powell, pp. 4-5, 634-7
- Priapus, 314, 316, 316-17, 334,  
 O25-6, 375-6
- Procne, 644, 647, 652
- prostitution: *see* 'brothels and  
 prostitution'
- protreptics on marriage: p. 10 n. 71,  
 p. 25, pp. 32-4
- proverbs/proverbial ideas, 53-4, 165,  
 270-1, 283-4, 284, 361, Q6, 486,  
 624, 627, 655-6
- Ptolemaeus/Seleucus, 558-9, 562-4
- Pudicitia, p. 11, p. 29, 1-24, 1, 14, 20,  
 306-13, 308, pp. 283-6
- Pygmies, 505-6
- Quintilian, p. 48, 75, 279-80, 281,  
 449-50, 453
- religions, Oriental: 314-45, nn. on  
 314-17 *passim*, 328, 508-47, 548-52
- religious and sacrificial practices, 329,  
 390-2, 392, 524-6, 539, 549, 551
- Remmius Palaemon, 452
- rhetoric, p. 1, pp. 7-8, 245, 449-50
- Richlin, p. 7, pp. 31-2, p. 36, p. 50
- rumour-monger, p. 25, 398-412, 398
- Sabine women, 10, 161-83, 163-4,  
 164, 286-300
- sacrilege, 311, 329, 540
- Salii, 603-4
- Sallust, p. 20, 286-300, nn. on  
 289-300 *passim*, 399
- Saturnalian gifts, 153-4
- Scipio Africanus, 168, 169, 170-1, 170
- seer, bogus, 508-47, 549
- Semonides, pp. 26-7, 402
- Seriphos, 563-4, 564
- sexual practices: bestiality, p. 20, p. 50,  
 334; boy-slaves, husbands'  
 involvement with, 25-37, 272,  
 376-8; eunuchs as lovers of women,  
 366-78, 373A-B; fellation: *see fello, as*  
*impurum*; geriatric sex, 193-4;  
 horse-riding position, 306-13, 311;  
 incest, p. 19, 157-8, 158, 160,  
 403-4; infibulation 73-4, 73,  
 379-80; lesbianism, p. 20, 306-13,  
311, 413-33, p. 286; massage, erotic,  
 p. 24, 413-33, 420-3, 422-3, 423;  
 masturbation, 196-7, 238; rear-entry  
 position, 333-4, 334; women or boys  
 preferable?, 25-37, 34

- sick-visiting, 235–6
- slaves: as lovers of upper-class women, p. 24, p. 29, 76–7, 81, 175, 279, 331, 600–1; names, 378, p. 284; as prostitutes, 118, 127, 320, p. 285; punishment of, p. 22, 219–23, 222, 414, 417, 474–507, 477–8, 479–80, 480; torture of in legal cases, O29, 485; *see also* ‘guards for women’; *see also* *aquarius*, *caupo*, *collectea*, *ergastulum*; *see also* *ornatrix*, *papas*, *praegusto*
- sleep, 269, 289, 415–16
- Sophocles, 633, 644
- stepmothers: amorous, p. 17, 133–5, 403–4; murderous, p. 12, p. 17, 627, 631, 641
- stylistic features: *adunaton*, 41–2; apostrophe, p. 7, p. 51, 80–1, 124, 265–7; ‘associative bridging’, p. 15; bathos, p. 18, 264, 334, 397, 504, 517–18, 653–4, 660–1; colloquialisms, 250–1, 280, 504; deflation, p. 6, 87, 101–2, 175, 418, 623, 657; *dilemma*, 200–30; diminutives, p. 50, 36, 105, 123, 146, 186, 194, 241, 260, 339, 372, 388–90, 551; *double entendre*, O7–13, nn. on 380–4 *passim*; elevated style undercut, p. 50, 80–1 (*see also* ‘deflation’ above); enclosing word order in hexameter, 241; epic allusions, 81, 83, 92, 165, 320–1, 326, 637, 649–50; *epiphonema*, 501, 626; *geminatio*, 166–7, 279–80; Golden line, p. 50, O16; Grecisms, p. 49, 63, 93, 194–5, 246, O6, 380–1, 422–3, 428, 449–50, 565; hyperbole, p. 28, p. 43, p. 49, 342–5; interlocutor, p. 50, 136–41, 142, 161, 637; ironic/debunking conclusion: *see* ‘deflation’ above; low register, p. 5, 13, 241, 516; mock-grandiosity, p. 50, 115, 181, 326, 544–5, 572, 637, 649–50, 660–1; *occupatio*, 55–7; oxymoron, p. 49, 66, 81, 118, 246, 278, 314, 597, 600, 622–3; paradox, p. 49, 139, O6, O7, O22, O26, 384, 597, 622–3, 636; parody, p. 49, 3, 10, 165, 172, 326, 328, 485, 497–501; *praeteritio*, 133–5, 602; prosaic expressions, p. 49, 181; *prosopopoeia*, p. 39 n. 215, p. 50, O27–34; rhetorical question, p. 50, 59, 60–2, 567–8; *sententiae*, terminal, p. 50, 362 (*see also* *epiphonema* above); sexual euphemisms, 37, 58–9, 301, 319
- suicide, p. 29, 25–37, 30, 31, 33
- Sulmo, 187
- Sybaris, 296
- table, sacred nature of, O4–5
- Tarentum, 297
- Thrasyllus, 576
- Thymele, 66
- toads, 659
- torture, O29, 474–507, 485, 624; *see also* ‘slaves: torture of’
- toupet* style, 502–4
- Tragedy, p. 5, pp. 11–12, p. 17, p. 27, p. 38, 627–61, 634–40, 634–7, 634, 636, 646, 655
- Trajan, p. 2, p. 4, p. 45, 205, 398–412, 403, 407, 409–11
- Tuccia, p. 15, 64
- Tullia, 306–8, 307, 312, pp. 283–6
- Tyrian purple, 246
- upbringing, influence of, 239–40
- urination as a gesture of contempt, 306–13, 309–10
- Ursidius, 38, 43, 45–6, 55–7
- varicose veins, 326, 397
- Veiento, p. 16, 112–13
- Vetula-Skoptik*, 144, 145
- Virgil, p. 23, p. 54, 320–1, 398–412, 435
- vomiting, pre-prandial, p. 32, 413–33, 427–9, 429; *see also* ‘dining customs’
- water, purificatory, 522–4, 523, 528
- wet-nursing, 354, 592–3
- wigs, 120, O16
- wills, 216–18, 242–3, 548–9
- wives, characteristics of: cruelty, 222, 413–33, 414–18, 415, 474–507, 479–80, 486; diaphanous clothing, wearing of, p. 35, 259; domestic tyranny, pp. 21–22, 30, 37, 136–41, 140, 149, 200–30, 207–8, 224, O5, O7, O14–16; dowry, exploitation of, pp. 43–4, 136–41, (*see also* *uxor dotata*); drinking to excess, pp. 25–6, pp. 28–9, 300–5, 300, nn. on 301–10 *passim*, 315, 413–33, 427–9; effrontery, 284–5, 285, 399;

wives, characteristics of (*cont.*)

gluttony, 302; Greek athletes, passion for, p. 45, 356; hating husband's friends, 215, 510-11; hypersexuality, p. 13, pp. 19-20, p. 42, 327; infidelity (devices for cloaking), 268-85; infirmity of judgement, 242-5; irascibility, 268-85, 413-33, 414-18, 415, 474-507, 497; litigiousness, 242-5; loquaciousness, 190, 438-40, 440; lower-class lovers, taste for, p. 13, p. 24, 279 (*see also* 'sexual practices: eunuchs as lovers of women', 'slaves: as lovers of upper-class women', 'stage and musical performers, love of' below); male behaviour aped, p. 18, 300-5, 306-13, 310, 401, 413-33, 446-7, 649-50; cf. 93; multiple marriages and divorces, 229-30, O17; murder, of relatives, 627-61 and nn. *passim*; being over-educated, p. 25, p. 46, 434-56, 444; prostitutes, behaving like,

114-32, nn. on 120-7 *passim*, 196-7, 259, 300-5, 301, 306-13, 311, 334, 506 (*see also* 'elegy'); quarrelsomeness, 35, 212-13, 268-85, 268-9, 268, 269; self-beautification, 457-73, 461-73, 464-5, 474-507, 482; self-control, lack of, p. 35, 647-9; sexual desire exceeding male desire, 128-30, 253-4 (*see also* 'hypersexuality' above); sexual jealousy, 268-85, 272, 278; shamelessness: *see* 'effrontery' above; spending money extravagantly, nn. on 149-57 *passim*, 232, 246, 352-65, 466, 508-47, 509; stage and musical performers, love of, p. 13, pp. 42-3, 63-4, 67-70, 72, 74, 379-97; superstitiousness, 508-47, nn. on 525-31 *passim*, 545, 585; timorousness, 93, 97 wool-working, 286-300, 289, 289-90; *see also lanificium/lanifica* words as weapons, 449-50 wrestling, female, 246

## LATIN WORDS

*acus*, 498  
*adamas*, 156  
*admitto*, 329  
*agger*, 588  
*alumnus*, 609  
*anticus*, 21  
*aquarius*, 331-2  
  
*barbae depositio*, 215  
  
*caligo*, 31  
*capistrum*, p. 14, 43  
*captator-trix/captatio*, 39-40, 40, 548-9  
*caput* (= *os*), 49, 301  
*caupo*, 591  
*cheironomia*, 63  
*chelidon*, Q6  
*cinaedus*, nn. on O1-34 *passim*, 515  
*citharvedus*, 73-4, 73, 74, 76-7, 76, 379-97  
*clunis*, p. 50, 334, O19  
*cognitio*, 485  
*collactea*, 307-8, pp. 284-6  
*colocyntha*, Q6

*color*, 279-80  
*comitor/comes exilii*, 82-113, 82, 469  
*concordia*, p. 20, p. 41, 231  
*consilium*, 497-501, 497, 498-9, 499  
*contendo*, O28  
*coturnus*, 506, 634  
*credo*, 1  
*criso*, 322  
*cruentus*, 525-6  
*crystallina*, 155  
*cucullus*, 118, 330  
  
*decolor*, 600  
*deductio*, 78, 201  
*deportatio in insulam*, 562-4  
*dignus*, 60-1, 161  
*discrimen*, 500-1  
*domiseda*, p. 24, 162  
  
*enthymema*, 449-50  
*ephemerides*, 574  
*ergastulum*, 151  
*exodium*, 71  
*extorquo*, 53-4

*Fama*, 398–412

*fello/fellatio/fellator-trix*, 51, 301, 307–8, 307, O5, O6, O7, O14–16, 384, pp. 284–6

*femina*, 60

*fides*, p. 20

*flammeum*, 225

*gaudium*, 365

*grammatici*, 435, 438

*grex*, 161, 175, 533

*haruspex*, 392, 397, 548–52, 587

*hippomanes*, p. 17, 133, 616–17

*hostia consultatoria*, 392

*impotentia muliebris*, pp. 34–5, 647–9; *see also* ‘wives, characteristics of: self-control, lack of’

*improbis*, 86, 605

*impudicitia*, p. 8, p. 13, p. 19, 49, 64, 299

*lanificium/lanifica*, p. 21, p. 24, p. 41, 162, 289, 289–90

*lanista*, 216–18, 216, O7–13, O7

*lanx*, 204, 205

*latus*, 37, O19

*leno*, 127, 216–18, 216

*leno maritus*, 140–1

*lex [operis]*, 635

*lippitudo*, 109, 578, 579

*locus de saeculo*, p. 34

*ludia*, 104, 266

*lutum*, 13

*luxuria*, p. 9, p. 13, p. 34, 80, 286–300, 292–3, 293, 294–5, 299, 300–5, 303–4, 428, 457–73, 466

*matronae*. *see* ‘wives, characteristics of’

*mediocris*, 582, 588

*minutio*, 282–3

*mollis*, 63, 91, 198–9, 300, O23, 366–7, 514

*moechocinaedus*, O20–2, O22, O27–34

*monstrum*, 286, 644–6

*murrina*, 155–6

*neruos*, O13

*obscenus*, 298, O1–2, 513

*obsequium*, p. 21, 223

*operas do*, 383

*opicus*, 455–6

*organum*, 380–1

*ornatrix*, 474–507, 490, 494–5, 495, 495–6, 498, 498–9

*os impurum*, 49, 51, O4–5, O5

*ouile*, 529

*paelex*, 272, 627

*paludamentum*, 400–1

*papas*, 633

*paupertas*, 295, 357, 357–9

*pono*, 320–1

*popanum*, 541

*praegusto*, 633, 660–1

*pudicitia*, pp. 9–10, pp. 12–13, pp. 19–20, p. 42, 1–24, 1, 7–11, 10, 45–6, 49, 58–9, 168, 287

*pudor*, 252, 357–9

*puella*, 127, 191, 258

*puer delicatus*, p. 42, 25–37, 377, 377–8, 378; *see also* *pusio*

*pupillus*, 629–33

*pusio*, 34

*rara avis*, 165, 172–7

*rudis*, 113, 248

*saeculum*, 24, 299

*salutatio*, 312–13, 312, 655–6

*seco*, 106

*simpuium Numae*, 343

*soloecismus*, 456

*spado*, 366–78, 373A–B, 376

*spina*, 583, 590

*sponsio*, O27

*stola*, 446, 589

*subligar*, 70

*tabellae*, 200, 233, 277–8

*Tarpeius*, 47–8

*tiara*, 516

*titulus*, 123

*tollo [liberos]* 38

*Triphallus*, O25–6

*turpis*, 97, 131–2, 241, 299, O3, O7–13, 457

*tympanum*, 515

*ubera*, 9

*uenefica*, p. 17, 626, 627, 638

*uenenum* (‘love potion’) 133, 626; (‘poison’) p. 18, 660–1

*uerecundia*, p. 25, p. 35, p. 44, 242-5,  
434-56  
*uetula*, pp. 30-1, 193-4, 194,  
241  
*uirtus*, 323  
*ulcus*, 462, 471-3, 472-3

*uniuira*, p. 23, 168, 230, 308  
*uniuiratus*, p. 23, 53, 206-7  
*uolua*, 129  
*uxor dotata*, p. 24, p. 30, 136-41,  
200-30  
*uxorius*, 206